CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXIV APRIL, 1947 Number 2

THE BIBLE AND THE WORSHIP SERVICE

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Crozer Theological Seminary

THE READING of a portion of the Bible as a part of the Christian church worship service is familiar to all of us. We probably have never attended a service in which it was omitted. Such an omission would seem not only unwarranted but inexcusable, and we should resent it emphatically. We may debate other elements of the service; the Bible reading is undebatable.

Yet, although we take it for granted, we should probably be unable to defend the practice beyond some such simple statement as, "The Bible is the very source of our religion," or "If we omit the Bible, what have we left as an authority?"—assuming, of course, that our defense would not be merely, "I do not like it omitted."

An examination of the history of the Christian worship service, then, should prove not only informative, but should give to the reading of the Bible as a part of that service both a meaning and a value. For the beginning of such a study we must go back to the synagogue service at the time of Jesus.

The synagogue was probably born of the exile. Deprived of the privileges and opportunities of the temple worship, the Jews gathered together in localized groups to hear the words of the law, from which came the knowledge of their responsibilities for their disaster as well as the source and promise of the hope that could be theirs through repentance. Here for the first time in the world's history there was a truly democratic and corporate worship dissociated from the actual offerings of bloody sacrifices. Their worship was truly the worship of the people and not of the priests, a worship centring in the reading and exposition of their sacred Scriptures. It was the first instance of a congregational form of worship. As Scott Brenner writes:

> The place of honor in the Synagogue and the focal point toward which all its worship was directed answering in part to the Holy of Holies in the Temple and to the subsequent Altar of the Christian Church, was the ark or chest, which served as the repository for the scroll of the Law. Through these scrolls God spoke to His

chosen people, and the idea was stressed that where the Word of God is there God must dwell.[1]

Indeed, it is highly probable that it was the reading and hearing of the law that gave the first impulse to there being regular assemblies for divine worship in the synagogal sense, as distinct from a revived temple worship. It has been suggested that such a pattern had its actual origin in the reforms of Josiah, but it cannot be dated later than the third century B.C.

> We are justified [says Oesterley] in stating that the earliest sources of the Mishnah show that the three ordinary daily services of the Jewish Liturgy consisted, already in the pre-Christian times, of two primary elements: (i) the *Reading of Scripture,* and (ii) *Prayer.* As to the first, the Torah (the Pentateuch) was read on Mondays and Thursdays, and on feast-days. On Sabbaths and feast-days there was read, in addition to the Pentateuch lesson, a passage from the prophetical books. These were, of course, always read in Hebrew; but there followed immediately a translation in the vernacular, and an explanatory exposition.[2]

This reading of the Pentateuch from early times was believed to have been commanded by Moses.[3]

Later there were lessons from the prophets. The lessons were not long, probably but a few verses, the reader determining how much of the prophets was to be read. Still later a lection was adopted. Any Israelite might read, but a priest or a Levite, if present, took precedence. It was customary to stand while reading. Exposition began in the time of Ezra;[4] this was the first step in preaching. From such expositions the Targums arose. Indeed, the rabbis understood this very passage to refer to the origin of the Targums. Of course the exposition was of the Pentateuch; the reading and exposition of the prophets did not come until later, approximately in the second century B.C. in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the public reading of the law was prohibited.

The synagogue was in many respects like the temple, modeled to some extent upon it. One distinctive feature of it was in the place given to the reading and exposition of the Scriptures. The articles of furniture that were not derived from their imitation of the temple were just those that had to do with the Scriptures. Articles borrowed from the temple retained their Semitic names; those peculiar to the synagogue had names derived from the Greek.

This conformity to custom is later seen in the interesting fact that the vision of heavenly worship portrayed in Revelation 4 ff. is actually a sublimation of public worship as the writer had seen it and been a part of

[1] Scott F. Brenner, *The Way of Worship,* p. 6.
[2] W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy,* pp. 36-37.
[3] Deut. 31: 9 ff.; *cf.* Neh. 8: 1-3, 18. [4] Neh. 8: 8.

it in the subapostolic period. Devan says, ". . . it is often assumed that this represents a Heavenly Court. It would be more correct to say that it represents a Heavenly Church."[5]

This was the synagogue in the time of Jesus, and whenever the Synoptic gospels show him taking part in its services, he is reading the Scriptures or teaching, its most characteristic activities. There were readings from the law and the prophets, the whole Scriptures being read through once in three years; in the Babylonian practice, once in a year. There were also readings for special occasions. At the Passover the Song of Songs was read; at Pentecost, Ruth; on the ninth of Abib, the anniversary of the destruction of the temple, Lamentations; at the Feast of Tabernacles, Ecclesiastes; and on Purim, the book of Esther.

Since Jesus and his disciples were Jews, it was in the synagogue that they worshiped, and their worship was Old Testament centred. Here they were in the beginning and here they stayed for a considerable time. They formed themselves into a compact religious association, and even the rise of what was later to be recognized as a Christian church would be considered simply a new synagogue. This would certainly occasion no surprise, and even if the members of such a synagogue had, like the Essenes, religious customs of their own, this, too, would be regarded as perfectly normal. The worship remained Jewish; the Scriptures were the Old Testament; the prayers were Jewish.

Although they continued to meet in the synagogue, they also met in private homes[6] and in such places as the lecture hall of Acts 19: 8-10. Gradually there were specialized changes. Sunday replaced the Sabbath, and the fast days were Wednesday and Friday instead of the Jewish Monday and Thursday.

The form of these services may be simply noted. Prayer was a very important element.[7] There were praise, thanksgiving, and psalms or hymns.[8] Teaching and preaching had a place.[9] I Cor. 14: 26 ff. suggests the informality of individual participation and initiative. I Tim. 4: 13 instructs, "Till I come, attend to the public reading of scripture. . . ."

To the services in the synagogue and the private homes must, of course, be added "the breaking of bread," that distinctive contribution of the Christians. However, since it is not in the main stream of our present consideration, it must, unfortunately, be left without much detailed attention. It will be sufficient to point out, first, that even here the elements of the Jewish liturgy were adopted by the church as an introduction to the

[5] S. Arthur Devan, *Ascent to Zion*, pp. 62-63.
[6] Acts 20: 7-11 *et pass.*
[7] Acts 1: 24, 25; 4: 24, 31; 12: 12.
[8] Acts 2: 47; 4: 24 ff.; I Cor. 14: 26 ff.; Col. 3: 16.
[9] Acts 20: 7 ff.; 28: 23, 31.

Eucharist. Some elements were incorporated into the actual service itself and have remained there to the present day. Second, and more important, with the introduction of the catechumenate a clear distinction was made between the preparatory portion of the eucharistic services and the Eucharist proper. Catechumens were admitted to the former, but dismissed from the latter. The entire liturgy of the catechumens centred in the reading of the Scriptures; the bringing of the sacred texts into the sanctuary and the preparation to read them being called the "Little Entrance," just as the entrance into the holy of holies in the liturgy of the faithful was called the "Great Entrance."

We return to the place of the Scriptures. Paul's attitude toward the Old Testament may be taken as illustrative of the early Christian view of these writings. Many of his words[10] show that he considered the Old Testament a Christian book, and it remained so even when second-century specifically Christian writings were gradually added to it. Actually the Septuagint came to be regarded as essentially the property of the Christians and not of the Jews.

For half a century, at least, we are in complete ignorance of the details of worship in the early Christian communities, as far as our knowledge from Christian sources goes. Early second-century information suggests that we are justified in saying, with Oesterley:

> . . . [the] influence of Palestinian Jewish Christianity on Gentile Christianity had been sufficiently strong to induce the latter not only to adopt from the former the main elements of the synagogal worship, but also, after the final severance of the Jewish and Christian Churches and the consequent cessation of attendance at the Synagogue, to transfer much of the Sabbath Synagogue worship to the specific eucharistic service on the first day of the week.[11]

With the coming of the second Christian century we are in possession of more information. True, I Clement, about A.D. 96, while it made no reference to the reading of Scriptures as a part of the liturgical service, did suggest an immediate knowledge of them either by private reading or public hearing, when it said to its hearers, "You have pored over the Holy Scriptures."[12] II Clement, about A.D. 150, which was perhaps a kind of sermon, spoke of a "reader," suggesting probably that reading was a fixed part of the liturgy, and giving rise to the question whether or not there was actually an order of readers in the church.

But it was Justin Martyr, whose death came about A.D. 167, who gives us the first clear and definite evidence that the reading of the Scriptures and a sermon were integral parts of the service. The quotation is familiar by frequent reference, but is definitely worth citing again.

[10] Rom. 15:4; I Cor. 9:10; 10:11; II Cor. 1:20.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

[12] I Clem. 45:2.

On the day which is called the day of the sun there is an assembly of all who live in the towns or in the country; and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then the reader ceases, and the president speaks, admonishing us and exhorting us to imitate their excellent examples.[13]

From this, several facts appear. The reader was not yet an official of the service; anyone could be called upon to read, even, as we know from other sources, a boy under twelve.[14] There was freedom of choice in the passage to be read. The length of the passage was not fixed by anything but the immediate determination of the reader, or "as long as time permits." Most important for our consideration is the fact that in addition to the Old Testament there was now being read what Justin Martyr calls the "memoirs of the apostles." By this time specifically Christian writings were taking their place alongside the Jewish Scriptures. The first instance of this is in Col. 4: 16—"And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea."

Within a very few years the church had a Bible of two parts, one taken over from the synagogue and one formed by itself. Von Dobschütz, in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* has a most interesting word of caution and warning concerning these two parts. He writes, "When, instead of their close relationship, their unity or identity is maintained, Christian worship is bound to sink to the level of the pre-Christian and inferior religion of the Old Testament."[15] A further note on this important step is expressed by Macdonald: "By the middle of the second century, Christianity had struck out its classic form of Sunday Service and laid down the framework for the worship of the future; for though varied and even surprising developments were destined to appear in the course of the centuries, these all took place *within* this simple framework, which has never been superseded."[16]

In this same century Clement of Alexandria speaks of Scripture reading and what he calls "true inquiry," *i.e.,* exposition.[17] Origen has several references to the subject.[18] Third- and fourth-century references, such as those of Cyril of Jerusalem,[19] the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,[20] the *Egyptian Church Order,*[21] and Tertullian,[22] continue the evidence for the place of the Scripture in the public worship service of the church.

[13] Justin M., *Apol.* i, 67, 3 f.
[14] Mishnah, Meg. iv, 5 f.
[15] Ernst von Dobschütz, "Bible in the Church," in *E.R.E.,* II, p. 582B.
[16] Alexander B. Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church,* p. 4.
[17] *Strom.* vi, 14.
[18] *c. Celsum,* iii, 50; *in Exod. Hom.* xiii, 1.
[19] *Catech.* iv, 35.
[20] *Apost. Trad.* 35.
[21] *Stat.* 48.
[22] *de Anima* 9; *de cult. fem.* ii, 11.

The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363, gave a list of books, "which should be read in the Church," including all our present canon except Revelation. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*ca.* A.D. 375) occurs this passage:

> Let the reader stand upon some high place: let him read the book of Moses, of Joshua the son of Nun, of the Judges, and of the Kings and of the Chronicles, and those written after the return from the captivity; and besides these, the books of Job and of Solomon, and of the sixteen prophets. But when there have been two lessons severally read, let some other person sing the hymns of David, and let the people join at the conclusions of the verses. Afterwards let our Acts be read, and the Epistles of Paul our fellow-worker, which he sent to the churches under the conduct of the Holy Spirit; and afterwards let a deacon or a presbyter read the Gospels. . . . while the Gospel is read, let all . . . stand up in great silence; for it is written: "Be silent, and hear, O Israel." And again: "But do thou stand there, and hear." [23]

Maxwell, in *"An Outline of Christian Worship,"* says of the worship pictured in the so-called Clementine Liturgy, contained in Book VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions*:

> We may observe the important place given in this corporate worship to the Holy Scriptures. Not only are the responses, psalms, and hymns drawn from the Scriptures, but the lections and their exposition are an integral part of the rite. So a didactic element is provided which is essential to intelligent participation in the holy Mysteries. This was characteristic of the worship of the early Church.[24]

With the completion of the building of Constantinople in A.D. 330 and the final division of the Roman empire into an Eastern empire and a Western empire in A.D. 395 there was the entry into the Middle Ages. The Christian church was also divided into an Eastern church and a Western church and developed separate liturgies.

An important addition to the Eastern liturgies, probably earlier than the fourth century, was the preparation for the reading of the Scriptures. After the fourth century this preparation, in some form, is a constant feature in all the liturgies. In order to understand the action it is necessary to visualize the arrangements of the sanctuary. At first the only division of the apse from the nave consisted of steps, but at a relatively early period a curtain was used that could be drawn at certain solemn parts of the service. After the fourth century the curtain became a screen that, except in Egypt and Cappadocia, was solid. It was decorated with raised pictures of Christ, the Virgin, the evangelists, apostles, and saints. These pictures were called icons and the screen the iconostasis. In the iconostasis were three doors, the centre one opposite the holy table and called the "royal door." This door was curtained. On the right was the "deacon's door" and on the left the "server's door."

[23] *Apost. Const.* ii, 57. [24] W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, pp. 33 f.

The Little Entrance occurred at the gospel, during the singing of the *Trisagion.* (The other lections were read from the ambo in the nave or even within the sanctuary, behind the screen.) When the gospel was about to be read, the deacon, bearing the gospel book and accompanied by the celebrant and a procession of ministers and acolytes bearing crosses, lights, and incense, came through the north door of the iconostasis, passed down to the centre of the church, where with censing and prayer the book was ceremonially blessed and kissed. Then the procession returned through the royal door to the holy table and, the door still remaining open, the deacon read or sang the gospel. The door was then closed.

The piety of the Eastern Church gave to all this a mystical significance. W. H. Frere thus explains its meaning:

> The entry of the Gospel, brought in with great procession and preceded by lights, shows the coming of the Saviour into the world: the Book is regarded as representing the presence of the incarnate Lord. The *Trisagion* of the congregation corresponds to the *Gloria in excelsis* of the angels; the *prokeimenon,* or respond, to the prophecies of the Old Testament; the Epistle with the apostolic witness. The *Alleluia* gives the attestation of David; and the Reading of the Gospel is the climax of the first cycle.[25]

While mystery dominated in the East, both East and West held the Eucharist as central, the remainder of the service being only preliminary to the great moment of the sacrament. Pseudo-Dionysius[26] was the first to view this preliminary part, including the Scripture, as a revelation of God in symbolic form; what, indeed, was all Scripture but a revelation through symbols? In the West, too, there is an attempt to give to this preliminary service a sense of mystery. Alexander of Hales sees in it a renewal of the preparation made in the history of Israel for Christ's advent in the flesh. So Christ's spiritual advent in the sacrament should be prepared for by such a repetition. Amalarius of Metz was the chief expositor of such a position. Brilioth summarizes his point of view:

> "The main idea was that the liturgy itself should be used so as to bring to remembrance the passion of Christ; the first part of the mass, however, deals with the history of Christ before his entry into Jerusalem. Some confusion of the order of events is inevitable. While the introit symbolizes generally the coming of Christ and his ministry, the *Gloria* shows the glory in heaven after his resurrection; and when the bishop sits down on his throne, there is symbolized the session of Christ at his Father's right hand. The Epistle, Gradual, and Gospel signify the proclaiming of the Old and New Covenants and Christ's own preaching. The salutation before the Offertory is the greeting of the crowd at the triumphal entry. When the priest offers the oblation, Amalarius sees the entry of Christ into the temple to offer himself to the Father. In the *Sanctus* He is greeted with the people's praise; the first part

[25] W. H. Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial,* rev. ed., (London, 1928), p. 54.
[26] *de Eccl. Hier.* 3.

of the Canon recalls the beginning of the passion and the disciples' flight. The remainder of the service symbolized the death of the Lord, the centurion's confession, the taking down of the body, the burial, the resurrection, the appearance at Emmaus, and lastly the ascension."[27]

The Christian Worship Service had come a long way from the simplicities of the synagogal service.

During the Middle Ages the church became more and more an empty pageant of ceremony and ritual. The Bible and the sermon passed into the background, even to the point of neglect. In the daily office, while the Old and New Testaments were the principal sources of the lections, there were provided also readings from the patristic writings, from the *Legendarius* (acts of the saints) and from the *Passionarius* (sufferings of the martyrs). In the service books used in England before the Reformation the lesson on the Feast of St. Deny's the Martyr read: "He took up his own head, after it was cut off, and walked on with it to the distance of two miles, carrying it in his hands. He wrote many admirable and heavenly books."[28] The lesson on the Feast of St. Francis was: "God willed to testify the sanctity of his servant by abundant miracles; of which this is especially famous, that when he was refused a passage over the Straits of Italy by the sailors, with his companion he crossed upon his cloak spread under him upon the waves. After his death, his body lying unburied continued so incorrupt that it even exhaled a sweet odour."[29]

Preaching was at a very low ebb. The preacher's task in the parish was confined to a short exposition of the gospels at the service of the Mass. Such homilies were frequently obtained from what was known as a *sleep-well.* The most famous of these compilations was entitled *Dormi Secure* (sleep without care), the work of John of Werden (d. 1437), a Franciscan of Cologne. Preachers were so glad to sleep well on Saturday nights that before the close of the fifteenth century the book went into twenty-five editions.

It is obvious that the sacrament of the Mass was the central feature of the worship service and that any form of a Word-of-God service that preceded it was of secondary importance and could be viewed only as a prelude to the sacrament.

With the coming of the Reformation a change in the worship service was inevitable. It is a mistake to suppose, as some do, that the Reformation sought to replace the Mass by a sermon; it sought to replace the Mass by a celebration of the Lord's Supper that was a sermon and a communion. The Mass was a sacrament the people observed; communion was an experience

[27] Y. T. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic,* p. 83.
[28] Quoted by Dyson Hague, *The Story of the English Prayer Book,* p. 30.
[29] *Idem.*

the people enjoyed. Part of this experience was the hearing of the Word of God.

For Luther, worship was the outcome of the saving truth about God; it was the true and real expression of belief. The Word was central. As the revealed sovereign will of God it fixed worship, which became not what we wish but what he wills. The determining factor in every service is no longer the church and the sacraments, but the Word and the sacraments. The Word represents the revelation through Scripture of redeeming love, lying in the whole of Scripture, which is not a record, but a revelation and so a communion. In worship the Word represents the glory of the grace of God, and the Lord is thus present. The Word has sacramental power; it is the real means of grace, privately as well as publicly.

Calvin did not wish to replace sacramental worship by a preaching service, but to restore the Eucharist to its primitive simplicity and proportion, and to give to the Scriptures their proper place. In the preface to his *Service Book* of 1545 he describes the parts of the worship service: confession of sins, words of absolution from the law and the gospels, Psalms, hymns of praise, reading of the gospels, Apostles' Creed, holy oblations and offerings, prayer for the salvation of all men, the sacrament. He concludes, "And because we receive Jesus Christ truly in this sacrament, . . . we worship him in spirit and in truth; and receive the Eucharist with great reverence, concluding the whole mystery with praise and thanksgiving. This, therefore, is the whole order and reason for the administration in the ancient church of the apostles, martyrs, and holy fathers." Thus, for Calvin, the Scriptures, read in course and expounded, were given their central place as in the ancient rites.

The long story of the translation of the Bible into the vernacular is an important contribution to our present interest, for it made the Scriptures not only available but intelligible to the people. Wyclif and his "poor preachers," whom he called "laymen," swept away the old sacramentalism and put into its place the individual interpretation of the English Bible by every simple, priestly reader.

In 1538 Henry VIII issued "The King's Injunction" requiring, among other things, that an English Bible be put into every church and that the clergy should do their utmost to encourage every one of their parishioners to read it. Those in power sensed the danger of this and cautioned that the Bible was not to be read at Mass, "nor afterwards for the purposes of discussion." They feared that knowledge of the Bible would produce heresy since the common people did not have the intelligence or the authority of the church. Such a procedure was dangerous. In 1543 it was provided that a chapter of the New Testament be read in English after the *Te Deum* and

the *Magnificat* every Sunday and holy day; the Old Testament to be similarly read when the New Testament was completed.

In 1549 appeared the English *Book of Common Prayer,* the second greatest religious book in the English language. It was the result of the thinking and laboring and praying of men who were Bible-centred in their religion and worship. In the Preface attention is called to the fact that the divine service has a "first original and ground" of the ordering of the matter, so that

> all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once in the year, intending thereby, that the Clergy, and especially such as were Ministers of the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation of God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able also to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth. And further, that the people (by daily hearing of holy scripture read in the Church) should continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.

In the service nothing was to be read but the Holy Scriptures. In the 1549 lectionary a chapter of the Old Testament and a chapter of the New Testament—exactly a chapter, no more and no less—were to be read morning and evening daily, Sundays and weekdays. It omitted the books of Chronicles, Song of Songs, parts of Ezekiel and the Revelation. Thereby the Old Testament and much of the Apocrypha were read once in every year, while the New Testament was read three times in a year, the gospels and the Acts in the morning and the epistles in the evening. A rubric in the first *Book of Common Prayer,* 1549, and repeated in the second *Book of Common Prayer,* 1552, preceded the reading of the lessons: "Then shall be read two Lessons, distinctly with a loud voice, that the people may hear."

This is not merely what it seems to be: the advice of a teacher of public speaking. It is a theological directive. There was to be no more reading of the Bible either unintelligibly in Latin or inaudibly in the priest's use of the subdued voice; it is to be the Bible heard and understood, a vital part of the worship service. It may be noted that the *Book of Common Prayer,* while it clearly states the place of the Bible in the service, actually leaves the sermon in an equivocal position. It announced to the brethren that they "are called to confession, thanksgiving, petition, and the hearing of God's most holy word."

Here was the worship once more firmly established as a people's service, an experience in which they actively participated and were no longer mere observers. They were a congregation and not an audience. As the second *Book of Common Prayer* instructed them, "The people shall answer . . ." "Then shall be said the Creed by the Minister and the people . . . ," and

"Then the Ministers, Clerks, and people shall say the Lord's Prayer . . . ." In such a people's service the Scriptures, after fifteen centuries, had come the full round of the circle and were once more central in a Christian worship service. In that central position, with the sermon, they held the spotlight, but the spotlight was occasionally moved and from its new positions cast different shadows.

John Smyth, our Baptist progenitor, had a very definite view of the Scriptures in the worship service. Set forms of worship, he held, were rather a matter of the memory, and reading from a book was not speaking from the heart. In his day there was no commonly accepted form of English translation of the Bible; several forms were used. Hence, no one could be "inspired." Moreover, the earliest Christians did not have all the New Testament books for use in their meetings. Therefore, the use of the Scriptures was not required as an integral part of worship; any translation was out of place. The original Hebrew or Greek was given by divine inspiration, but ordinary men wrote books, among them the translations of the Bible.

Smyth held that the Scriptures were not to be retained as helps to spiritual worship, and some of his reasons were as follows: 1. Christ used the book to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. 3:15) and then closed the book in the synagogue to show that book worship was now finished (Luke 4:20; John 19:30). 2. No books of the New Testament were written for at least seven years after Pentecost. The churches could not have used books that they did not have. 3. When we read we receive matter out of books into the heart; when we pray, prophesy, or sing we utter matter out of the heart into the ear of the church. 4. On the Day of Pentecost fiery cloven tongues appeared, not fiery books. The law gave books; the gospel came in tongues.[30] Smyth does wonder whether preachers may not read originals in the worship, shut the book, and then prophesy from them; whether Scripture may be interposed between parts of the service, not as worship, but as a further preparation for worship.

In commenting upon this, Burgess remarks: "It is significant that in at least one of the Unitarian General Baptist Churches of Kent down to well within living memory [1911] the reading of Scripture was used in precisely this way while the congregation was assembling and settling down for actual worship."[31]

To return to Smyth. He disapproved of the common practice of his day whereby long, analytical, Scriptural sermons were preached, the preacher quoting proof texts for his points and the congregation busily

[30] Walter H. Burgess, *John Smith the Se-Baptist*, pp. 120 ff.

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 129.

engaged in searching for these texts in their Bibles. Smyth thought this was rather a scholastical lecture and not ecclesiastical worship. "Searching quotations hindereth attention," he wrote, "for the mind and affections are distracted from hearing by seeking the places."[32]

The practice of Smyth was carried over into the New England churches. There was no plain reading of the Bible in the form of "lessons." When the Bible was read, it was at the same time expounded. To read a set passage without note or comment savored of the formal and the ceremonial. Palfrey, in his *A History of New England,* says:

> Two services were held each Sunday, both by daylight. They consisted of extemporaneous prayers, singing of the Psalms in a metrical version, without instrumental accompaniment, and a sermon, of which the approved length was an hour, measured by an hour-glass, which stood upon the pulpit. The public reading of the Bible, without exposition, was generally disapproved, being regarded as an unbecoming conformity to the hierarchical service, and qualified by the opprobrious name of *dumb reading.*[33]

In the case of the Pilgrims the service began with prayer, during which the congregation stood, not kneeling as was the idolatrous Roman practice. After the opening prayer, often continuing for an hour or more, Pastor Robinson read aloud from his Geneva Bible, "always with comment and exposition, for mere 'dumb reading' was prohibited by the Holy Discipline."[34]

One other attitude of the New England churches toward the reading of the Bible in the worship service should be noted. Lewis and Newhall, in their *History of Lynn, Essex County, Massachusetts,* tell how at first the church considered the sermon of minor importance, the emphasis being placed upon the reading of the Scriptures, the prayers, the psalms, the anthem, and the litany. Indeed, the sermon was not delivered at the hour of worship, but at a different time, of which due notice was given.

> But [they continue] those docile children of that "dear mother," when they found themselve safe in this western Canaan just reversed matters. They made the sermon the leading feature at the sanctuary, which they preferred to call a meeting-house, rather than a church, and reduced the little semblance of worship they retained, to a mere appendage to the sermon. . . .
>
> Such a thing as the reading of the Bible in a New England Congregational meeting-house was hardly known before the first part of the last century [the eighteenth], save in a few instances, where the ministers, having been bred in the Church, could not bring their minds at once to dispense with what they had been taught was a matter of first importance. As early as 1699, however, Rev. Mr. Colman, of Boston, read it in his church. And he often repeated the Lord's prayer,

[32] J. Smyth, *Differences,* p. 18.
[33] J. G. Palfrey, *A History of New England,* Vol. I, p. 288.
[34] George F. Willison, *Saints and Strangers,* p. 86.

after an introductory one of his own. But many were strongly prejudiced against his innovations. The Ratio Disciplinæ says that in 1762, the practice of reading the sacred volume had obtained in many churches without giving offense. It does not appear when the Scrptures began to be read in the church at Lynn. But the First Church of Salem adopted the custom in 1736. It was not, however, till many years after, that the other churches of that place followed her good example—the Tabernacle in 1804 and the South Church in 1806. The neighboring church of Medford, in 1759, voted "to read the Scriptures in the congregation." [35]

The Bible as a part of the church worship service has had a varied history, moving like a pendulum from a place of central importance to one of neglect, even disapproval. It is enlightening to remember this when we hear it read in our churches today, and to remember, as well, that theological creeds have not been the only point of controversy and schism. In the light of all this there certainly should be a word of warning and a word of promise for our present-day practice and experience.

How can we complacently countenance such performances as that of a Philadelphia Baptist church in 1938? The minister began to read the New Testament at 3 A.M. and was followed by seventy-two other members of the church, reading for fifteen minutes each, until 10 P.M. when the minister completed the reading of the New Testament. Or what shall we say of the fifteen members of that Baptist church in Maine who started to read the Bible through at 12.02 A.M. on New Year's Day, 1945, and finished in seventeen hours and forty minutes? The New York *Times* said they beat the world's record by five minutes! Perhaps the less we say the better. We do not need to spend time on these vagaries; the otherwise normal reading of the Scriptures will provide material for our serious thought.

One of the strangest practices of ministers is that of letting others read the Bible in their worship service. We should not for a moment consider suddenly inviting a visiting clergyman to preach the sermon; yet we feel it is only courtesy to ask him to leave his pew, come to the pulpit, and read the Scriptures. Pattison has a pointed word to say about this practice. "Take this part of the service yourself. You are under no obligation to invite into the pulpit any minister who happens to be present. If he is wise he will prefer to be allowed to remain in the pew; if he is not wise that is the best place for him."[36]

If a minister has an assistant, particularly a student, the result seems to be inevitable. Let the assistant begin his apprenticeship by reading the Bible; the prayer and probably the sermon will be his later reward, but not now—the Bible is a harmless proving ground. The practice of most ministers, as I have come to know it, is to tell the assistant in the study, just

[35] A. Lewis and J. R. Newhall, *History of Lynn, etc.*, p. 105.
[36] T. H. Pattison, *Public Worship*, p. 153.

before the service, what he is to read. Considerate ministers even hand him a Bible so that he may find the place and go over it for hard words. Some very thoughtful ministers let the assistant know what he is to read as early as Saturday night. Then these ministers come to the instructor in public speaking and complain about his failure to teach the proper reading of the Scriptures to the student. Some day the instructor is going to tell his students to refuse to sight-read the Bible publicly for anyone—especially a fellow minister.

Speaking of students—will they accept counsel from a layman? He is a distinguished layman delivering the Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale University more than thirty years ago. On that occasion George Wharton Pepper, a Philadelphia lawyer, spoke sentences that should be carefully considered by any candidate for a pastorate who spends all his time on that great moment for which he knows the congregation will be waiting—the preaching of the sermon.

Said Mr. Pepper: ". . . the preacher has surely created a strong prejudice for or against himself before he actually begins his sermon. . . . Speaking for myself, I am powerfully affected by the bearing of a man during service time. I find that, if he reads from the Bible, a great deal can be gathered respecting his inner self. There are all sorts of ways of reading the Scriptures." After rejecting the dramatic personalization of each character, the "affected solemnity of the reader who employs a scripture voice" and "the repulsive familiarity" of one who reads trivial and important alike, he speaks of the "two primary qualifications for effective reading—a clear understanding of the significance of what he reads and an earnest intention that the people shall be the better for hearing it. . . . I can recall occasions in my life when the earnest, intelligent and reverent reading of particular chapters has marked an epoch in spiritual experience."[37]

Do you remember the incident told of a conversation between David Garrick and the archbishop of Canterbury? The archbishop asked Garrick why the audience of the theatre was so much larger and more responsive than the congregation of the church. Why did Garrick have such a following? The reply should be placed over the desk of every minister. "Why, sir," replied the great actor friend of Dr. Johnson, "the reason is that you make truth sound like fiction, while I make fiction sound like truth."

Even when the minister himself reads the Bible, it is often a very shoddy performance, giving the impression that he considers it at best only of third-rate importance. His voice is bad, his enunciation slovenly, his whole manner uncertain and indifferent, as though he believed literally the words, "No scripture is of any private interpretation," and had never even

[37] George W. Pepper, *A Voice from the Crowd*, pp. 8-9.

heard of those older words, "So they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." His whole manner says loudly, "We'll get this over with as quickly as possible; but don't go to sleep. I'll be back soon for the sermon."

James Black delivered the James Sprunt Foundation Lectures at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia. He said:

> I told you in an earlier lecture that before beginning my work for this course, I invited the opinion and criticism of some intelligent laymen regarding the subject of these lectures. In almost every reply some critical mention was made of the public reading of Scripture. Some complained about *manner*, and some about *selection*. One correspondent remarked that certain preachers conveyed the impression that they had only hurriedly chosen their passages in the vestry, at random, a few minutes before entering the pulpit. Generally, it was averred that the reading of Scripture was often casual, unstudied, and sometimes unintelligent.[88]

Perhaps it was the result of some such experience that led John Wesley to say of a certain congregation that they ought to pay their minister not to read the Scriptures to them.

One great reason for such a condition lies in the fact that most ministers —and through them their congregations—have come to regard the whole service prior to the sermon as mere preliminary to the preaching of God's Word. What Word of God? The Word that has just been read, of course. So the reading of the Bible becomes only the public hearing of that portion of Scripture from which the sermon will be taken. The only time that sequence is broken is when the minister preaches a sermon for which his knowledge of the Bible and his concordance provide no adequate selection to be read. Then he reads the Twenty-third Psalm, Isaiah 53, or I Corinthians 13. There is great need for the restoration of a lection, by which the congregation will hear the whole Bible read for its beauty, its messages, and its inspiration. Two readings—one from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament—read with intelligence and devotion will give both the pulpit and the pew an experience now almost lost to the modern church. There is nothing new about either a lection or the reading of two lessons. Both procedures have an ancient and worthy history. There is something very important and very vital about them.

The Bible reading can be made a most important and effective part of the worship service—it can be made a moment of real worth. It should be so. If it ever is less than that, if it ever is a mere gesture made as a concession to custom, if it ever comes to be a matter-of-fact, uninteresting because uninterested, presentation of so many sentences from an ancient book—then the reader has marked himself as insensitive and inconsiderate,

[88] James Black, *The Mystery of Preaching*, p. 234.

and the congregation has been deprived of one of the moments of high inspiration.

We have just used the phrase "sentences from an ancient book," and the connotation was depreciative. But that very phrase should be rather the challenge to a serious consideration of one of the most important facts about our Bible and about our present-day Christianity. Religion is not a recent discovery of man; worship, for all our modern adaptations and adjustments, is not a twentieth-century conduct pattern. They both have an ancient and respectable history. In that history Christianity has shared; it was not born last Sunday morning. "We are not the first wave that ever broke upon this beach." We often think and act as though we were. A sense of historicity, a consciousness of ancient tradition, and the resulting perspective in judgment provide one of the surest forms of stabilization. Our public reading of the Bible should give to our hearers the experience of fellowship with the struggling centuries, by which we come to know ourselves as the inheritors of a worthy past. The man, especially the religious man, who has not heard "the music of the spheres" is poor indeed, and because he has not their music in his soul, is truly fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils.

We have become accustomed to blame the loss sustained by the Bible on a liberal, critical study and teaching of it. The greater loss has come from a poor public reading of it in the worship service. Not the critical consideration of it, but the inability to see the power of the resulting text is the real thief. The uncriticized text is no more important, no more beautiful, no more inspired—and no more inspiring. The fault, dear reader, is not in our critics, but in ourselves, that we are uninspiring! Graduates of a liberal school who find that they cannot preach a modern theology have simply confessed that they are not artists, but mechanics; that they have no creative ability, but only the capacity for imitation; that they are not prophets, but peddlers. If we cannot read the Bible devotionally in private, we cannot read it worshipfully in public. The waters of life, like those of any other stream, never rise higher than their source within us. The great rivers that turn the wheels of industry and light the world have their origins in quiet and solitary places.

There is a very definite need, and this is a propitious time for the restoration of the Bible to a place of importance and influence. Much has been said about a revival of expository preaching; it is time something was done about the inspired public reading of Scripture in the worship service of the Christian church. The church will receive the Bible; will the ministry give it?

THE RELIGIOUS RADICALISM OF JESUS*

JAMES HARDY ROPES
Harvard University

WHAT WE SEEK to learn in studying classical types of thought or of art is the secret of their power. It is a quest destined never to be wholly successful. Different ages will give different answers. Yet it is instructive, for our imitation, for humbling of our own pride, and therefore for our growth in tolerance. And so we ask with reference to Jesus Christ for the traits which have given his thought power, at first and persistently.

It is evident that two aspects of Jesus Christ were somewhat distinct: his character and life; and his sayings, precepts, or parables. The former was apparently the earliest to be the subject of attention and reflection by the church and to find written record. The personality and the miracles were the most noticeable thing, the conflicts of his life, the final tragedy of the cross. So Mark and Paul.

Then came the interest in his sayings. They were less striking than the facts of his life, but they led to the collection of sayings now accessible to us in Matthew and Luke. It shows traces of various phases of primitive thought and life—Jewish-Christian restrictions, the rivalry of followers and admirers of Peter and of James, the authority of the Twelve, the condition of missions, the question of freedom from the law, the fall of Jerusalem. All this survival of phases of its history shows the early date at which the material was collected. But it also shows that our reports have been affected by the history and cannot be treated as if they were strictly primitive writings. They require analysis and criticism.

Criticism of the gospels hitherto has been occupied with the literary relations of documents and their origin. We must now try to fathom the earlier history of tradition, written or oral, by penetrating study, and by analogy, and by investigation of Aramaic and Hebrew sources which may have been translated in our Greek books.

Later, in the second century, the relative interest in these two aspects of the tradition, namely, the life and the teachings, was often reversed. The fundamental significance of Jesus Christ's person and death and resurrection had become fully established, but the church's interest was in the practical precepts of his moral teaching rather than in the facts of his career. The latter were largely interesting as fulfillment of prophecy,

* Among papers left at his death in 1933 by the late Hollis professor of divinity at Harvard were notes of an address given on several occasions between 1915 and 1920 but apparently never printed. The contents seemed to his successor of sufficient general value to warrant their publication even at this late date. Some editing was necessary, but the thought and most of the wording are believed to be faithful to the original author.—Henry J. Cadbury.

not for themselves. Their presentation continued to be limited to Mark's framework. The sayings, however, came to Greek minds with a freshness which they had not had for Jews, accustomed to similar teaching from their rabbis.

As we look back at the historical figure of Jesus and ask about the special traits which gave and have ever given power to his thought, as distinct from the theological interpretation of his person and of his death, we find ourselves led to a combination of these two aspects—personality and words. His personality comes to us shrouded in the wrappings of theological interpretation. Even our earliest records show this and have to be studied with critical caution. His words likewise have not been kept intact. Just because his moral teachings were so similar to the best Jewish teaching of his time it was not difficult to expand or supplement or modify them in the process of transmission, to adapt them to current needs. For we must remember that the purpose of the gospels was wholly practical and contemporary, not historical. We today on the other hand perversely enough want the talent that was hid in a napkin rather than that which has been used, fructified, and so transformed.

Because of this state of the tradition we cannot expect to learn much from philological study or the delicate weighing of the several words, which at best come to us in translation, or from contexts which are probably artificial, or not original. These are valuable if they prove fruitful. But our chief source will be those passages whose general sense in any language is clear. We shall find conviction coming to us if we can discern important large personal traits, common to many sayings and to ways of presenting various ideas, traits which could well be remembered because they distinguished Jesus Christ from other teachers of his time.

To one of these, and a highly characteristic trait, I wish to direct attention, not as though it were the only one or as though all persons would put it first. Yet it rightly should be given prominence. It is the sweeping, surprising, often repellent radicalism of Jesus. I believe this trait to be real. It lies on the surface of the record, and it goes down deep into the roots of Jesus' nature. His personality here expresses itself in his words, not merely his opinion. Let us see how this appears. It is found everywhere.

The substance of Jesus' ideas about God and duty are the common stock of Jewish thought. We must not shrink from acknowledging this. This stock includes the ideas of God as the Father as well as the King, the spiritual monotheism of Isaiah 40-66, the piety of the Psalms. So Jesus speaks of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He himself worships none other, and he knows the love and mercy of God.

So too the morality of Jesus' teaching is that of the Ten Commandments and of the rabbis' application of them. Take the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* which are full of just such teaching as Christian books contain, or as Jesus gave. Even the two commandments of love are found in combination. We gain nothing but confusion of thought and humiliation in argument if—with the learned and devout Jew a few streets away—we try to obscure all this. The Christian religion does not depend on its novelty for truth. The Old Testament and our use of it is enough to forbid such a heresy, like Marcion's. Christianity depends on new power, not chiefly on new truth. This is fortunate because it enables us to look for the positive side and does not expose us to confutation through new historical knowledge. It was the way in which Jesus used these ideas that is important, for he made these ideas thorough; he conceived and expressed them radically. In this radicalism lay the element at least of the power.

This is the place to observe that it was not economic radicalism which characterized Jesus' thought. Such ideas in ancient times usually took the form of agrarian reform or political revolution. Neither of these was found in Jesus. The latter he expressly rejected on many occasions.

The object of modern economic radicalism is so to change fundamental principles of society (*e.g.*, private ownership of capital and freedom of contract) that the mass of people will have more share than now of the product, more joy in their work through sense of control or other incentive to personal interest, and thus and in other ways lead more comfortable and secure lives. Of all this there is nothing in our gospels. They are not concerned to show how to get more things. The kingdom of God is not a state of greater material comfort, except in Jewish convivial notions parallel to Mohammedan ones.

Why, then, is such an interest sometimes claimed for Jesus? First, because he offered hope to the outcast, the religiously disinherited, the religious proletariat. Second, because he denounced cruelty and deplored the moral degeneracy of the rich. This trait of the rich is true in all times and was not peculiar to Jesus' lifetime. In our own time it is much diminished partly through the moral scruples of the Christian rich and partly through better understanding of the sources of social welfare and the danger of oppressing a powerful body. Both factors have led to a greater sense of social responsibility than ever before in the world. But Jesus was not concerned as to how to make the poor more comfortable. He rather tried to warn the poor against the temptation to envy the rich, and grieved in one notable instance at the moral failure of the rich man

himself. This was like the attitude of the prophets, but in Jesus it was from the point of view of love of men's souls, not of economic improvement, much as that may have been needed.

Not here, then, do we find Jesus' radicalism but rather in the other aspect of his attitude toward the poor to which I have alluded. God is a God of mercy, the only God, the heavenly Father. Hence Jesus saw the privilege of the human soul as a soul. No one could be disinherited. From the most unlikely came the best response. This is religious radicalism, and the Christian church drew the true inference, under the guidance of men who had been in contact with Jesus' free spirit, and decided that Christianity could not recognize any limitation of God's interest to Jews. This was the first great controversy and the greatest one in Christian history. On settling it right depended the whole character and the persistence and growth of Christianity.

So it is throughout. There is nothing in Jesus' teaching but has its roots here. There is much that is mere repetition in substance and form, but it is made thorough in application. This was evident to the early Christians as Matthew 5 shows. There a leading, conspicuous trait is made even more so by the context. Righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, and Jesus shows how it can be done. He illustrates by his teaching on anger and on lust. It is character that counts, not the accidental opportunity for the consummation of impulse. We must note here the difference between conventional morality and real character. The development of real character in any good type is an act of worship, accepted as such by God. It often is not recognized by us, and we contrast the "moral man" with the man of religious faith, because we confound conventional morality with real character.

This characteristic radicalism finds its fit mode of expression in Jesus' method of exaggeration, as the camel and needle's eye, and in his use of extreme instances, as his injunction to pluck out the eye that offends or to leave the gift unoffered at the altar in order first to be reconciled to an offended brother. These are radical ways of speech of a radical, and they suit the temper of his thought.

Yet we must be careful to see what direction his radicalism really takes. It is often not the one our thought most naturally follows. We are apt to stay by the external, while Jesus penetrates to the interior.

Take the sayings about nonresistance. Neither the responsibility of the statesman nor that of a voter was here in Jesus' mind. He is of course not limiting his injunctions to the three cases mentioned, but his instances are all of personal injury. He is not saying that all application of force against evil or for maintenance of rights is contrary to the law of God.

To say that would forbid a community to maintain police for repressing the white-slave traffic! He goes much further, but in a different direction. In his radical way he expresses so radical a principle that no man has ever lived up to it, and it runs counter to what many hold to be the dictate of the highest morality. We often take him as if he were a Pharisee making rules for outer conduct and drawing distinctions of casuistry. He is forbidding the resentment from which springs revenge and the assertion by force or otherwise to another's hurt of man's so-called honor, the maintenance by arms of so-called national dignity. He forbids a man to hit back, not to protect his home. He forbids indulging the feeling of resentment, uttering the angry word, committing the act of revenge. He says nothing whatever about force as such, force properly used.

Were his words directed to the Zealots? They apply as much, and as directly to legal measures, *e.g.*, on behalf of oppressed working men, as they do to war. Certainly they apply to many moments in the individual's life. The principle affects nations, even more subtly tempted than individuals. But there is nothing here about war. Are we to suppose that Jesus deemed the Maccabees to have been traitors to their God? Peace is a state of the community indispensable for human comfort and welfare, worth devoting one's life to secure. So are sanitation and other improvements. But Jesus is not commending peace but peaceableness. Peace is not exactly a moral ideal, but a desirable end. Not those who are able to find a home in a quiet land are blessed but the peace-*makers*.

It is Jesus who is here the radical, not we, for we have rarely even understood the wide reach of his meaning and have never obeyed his command fully. Here again Jesus is not thinking of comforts, not even of those of peace, but of the soul of the individual man.

So we may go through his teaching. It is always radical. There is no adjustment, no qualification. The current morality is made thorough and is stated without reserve. Take divorce, and see how practical caution inserted, perhaps even before Matthew was written, "except on the ground of fornication." Jesus is correctly represented in this matter by the agreement of the other two gospels. The same secondary qualification is indicated by the addition of the words "without a cause" to the sweeping prohibition of anger. Or take the matter of food. A radical distinction is drawn between a ritual and a moral rule. The material must not intrude into the realm of the ethical. Or the duty of service: service is not to stop short of complete sacrifice of life itself. For nearly everything one can find a parallel in Jewish teaching. Jesus did not assume to give a new morality, but a more intense one. His distinction lay in this radical temper.

It is the same radical temper which meets us in a wholly different sphere, in eschatology and apocalyptic expectation. This is strange to us because of the strangeness of the idea which has not been justified by the fulfillment of the end of the world by a catastrophe as the means of bringing in the triumph of God's cause. It is also strange to us because it seems to turn thought aside from this world and its duties and to draw attention to another world and its privileges. Over against each other stand the world-affirming and the world-renouncing attitude, the "sensible" and the radical view, the practical man and the visionary.

To us the radical eschatological attitude is impossible. We try to eliminate it in order to secure a Christ psychologically comprehensible and like ourselves. In doing so we not only mutilate the gospels but we do no justice to this trait of Jesus Christ. As a radical he cut himself off from marriage and the duties of the man in society. He made little of much that to us is of grave import. He pictured the future as we cannot. Yet by doing this he made possible the Christian religion. He gave it a passionate hope. He presented the high claims of complete renunciation of self-interest and of the immediate welfare of others when heroic duty calls.

At the present moment of catastrophe men's minds are turned to apocalypses. Today it is easier than ever before to understand how this type of thinking could have established itself. We find it almost easier to imagine the end of all things than to see how the world of Europe can reconstruct itself. Apocalyptic radicalism becomes intelligible as never before. Such radicalism is in accord with other traits of the supreme Man, the Lord from heaven.

The nineteenth century produced a conception of Jesus Christ congenial to itself and to its temper of peaceful industrious progress under the leadership of science and good will. The liberal critics believed that they had found the real facts and that in them was portrayed a Christ adapted to the modern world which they fancied to be a permanent state of civilized mankind. He was a moderate, wise, and gentle teacher, while the fantastic eschatology was ascribed to the perverse traditionalism of his disciples. His words presented truth and duty in ever-apprehensible forms, singularly free from conditions of time and place.

A shock came in a sudden and widespread contention that this Jesus never existed and was a figment of the imagination of a religion of emancipated Judaism. The fault lay with the critics and their attempt to bring Christ down to modern terms. The argument against the historical Jesus can only be met by showing him to be a man of his time and a person of distinctive type.

And now a shock has befallen the world into which the critics thought

they had brought their Christ! It will be easier to believe in a Radical when this war has left the world comfortless, grieving, open to radical and unexpected changes in society and thought such as we cannot foresee.

Must we then be radicals? The imitation of Christ is for all, but it is of the heavenly Lord, and imitation is the yielding to his divine Spirit pervading and transforming our hearts. The copying of Jesus is not asked of us. There are various types acceptable to God. This is shown in the variety of the New Testament which gives us beside Jesus the type of the Epistle of James with its reasonable religion and the Apostle Paul, a catholic and an adapter to the existing world. Jesus' personal type and temperament is a permanent one, but not one for all. Not all share his method or his individual ways. Not all are called to be radicals as not all are called to abstain from marriage or to die at the age of thirty-three. From him, under divine guidance, we can learn the true development of our own type, because he was a radical, but it must be by a translation not a transference. Yet in his radicalism lay the specific power of his words. That transformed men, and through them by many types of men —he has transformed and will transform the world.

A BASIC COMMON FAITH

OLIVER J. HART
Bishop of Pennsylvania

"As a former Army chaplain let me express my own conviction that it is near ludicrous for Protestants to be complaining about Roman Catholic activities in the Armed Forces until we can present a basic common faith and a fellowship to be proud of." This statement by a former Army chaplain has presented an interesting problem for the non-Roman churches. It is contended by some Protestants that they cannot present a basic common faith because it is of the very essence of Protestantism that it continually outgrows its creeds: "The Roman Catholic program is precise and definite. Protestantism is essentially an attitude and cannot be definite."

> There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

These oft-quoted words of Tennyson are echoed and reëchoed by many Protestants as they rejoice in their freedom of thought. I would not for a moment underestimate the value of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. I would not want all Christians to have to think alike. But the protest of this ex-chaplain is a healthy one. We do not have to be *vague* and *uncertain.*

At times we are inclined to indulge in glittering generalities. Our "it is generally agreed that such and such is the truth" is often only a repetition of something we heard over the radio or on a street car. Phillips Brooks tells the story on himself, and many another minister could do the same, that one day in the pulpit of Trinity Church, Boston, he said, "If I had fifty men, I could clean up Boston." After the service fifty men came to him and said, "We are all ready. What do you want us to do?" He had no plan and had to tell them so. When I was in the General Seminary in New York, our class was shocked by being told by a speaker that we were an *easy* group with whom to discuss controversial issues. "You always ask the same questions," he said, "but if you talk to labor leaders you have to be ready for a severe cross examination. They will fire questions at you, and your knowledge must be exact. Glittering generalities will be of little avail."

In two respects, at least, I think that this chaplain's request should be met. In Protestant circles there has been a tendency to decry theology. I quote a sample:

For very many today, the portrait of Christ is obscured by a whole mass of dogmas and accretions which the church has gradually developed. If the church hopes to win modern youth into its life and fellowship it must profoundly modify its dogmatic creeds. Access to the Lord of the church is for many made impossible by unnecessary obtacles which the church itself has created and which the church must remove.

Such a statement has force if its purpose is to emphasize the necessity of making clear what Christian belief is and what kind of life it involves. It is hopeless if it gives the impression that we can get along without theology.

Our religion has been greatly vitiated during the past fifty years by the absence of a sound and informed theology. The following statemen from another chaplain is to the point.

We live in an era in which there is no real belief in anything. We have no living faith to put into the place of the one so many of us have given up. We are living on the "leftovers" of the age of faith, and receiving spiritual energy from sources that we don't even bother to acknowledge, so much have we watered them down. We need a much more virile faith today than either liberal religion or orthodoxy has to offer.

A college man said to me, "I understand what it means to lead a fairly decent life, but you preachers use strange words, like *salvation,* and I haven't the foggiest notion of what the word means." The answer is not to tell him, "All right. Forget it." The answer is to explain what salvation means. Theology need not be dull and uninteresting. If we could make our college men understand clearly that Jesus "came to seek and to save that which was lost," we would deepen their sense of duty, give them new motives, and open wider vistas of service.

We need a firm grasp upon the main principles of our faith, and this will demand the use of our God-given minds. We cannot go far today without realizing that this will mean agony and heart-searching. Behind the universe there is a Creator whose nature is revealed in Jesus. In him we see God. In him we see the meaning of life. In him we see victory over the grave. The strength and power of the Christian religion has been and is the linking of Jesus' name with God—the Creator is the Redeemer. The Incarnation comes to us with the announcement of what God is.

A friend of mine recently said: "The voice of the church at the present time is like a broken reed in the midst of blaring trumpets and bursting bombs. Why is it? The basic reason, I think, is that a majority of church people in their secret minds and hearts are no longer sure that the Christian answer is true." If my friend is right, if this is what keeps the Protestant church from sounding a clear and unmistakable note, then we

ought to get out of the way and not hinder those who do believe with all their hearts and minds and souls that Christ is the answer. The Collect, in the *Book of Common Prayer,* for the Embers days begins, "O Almighty God, who hast committed to the hands of men the ministry of reconciliation." The church is in the world to reconcile men with God and with each other. That is her one and only task. We are set in the midst of people who are certain only of their uncertainties. We get excited about Russia trying to do away with the Christian religion when we should be excited about the United States trying to do without it. Into our hands is committed the ministry of reconciliation. We differ in form of church government and modes of worship. The test remains the same—does our ministry help to reconcile men to God and to one another? If we really believe that the Christian answer is true, let us act upon it first in our own personal lives and then proclaim it in no uncertain voice.

In the second place we need to examine carefully the rediscovered concept of the church as the mystical Body of Christ. There is no such thing as a solitary Christian. Christ died that he might bring us to God; not simply as individual saved souls, but as a saved fellowship, a holy community. It is very difficult for the average city dweller to retain a sense of community. He is sorely tempted to feel responsible only for what affects him personally. Recently I heard a distinguished layman, addressing a large group of businessmen, make a powerful plea for a stronger church. He was asked, "Of what church are you a member?" His answer, "None. I used to belong to —— denomination but I didn't like what they were doing, so I quit. And I haven't found any other church that I like as much as I hate them!" I compare this statement with St. Paul's when he exhausts his vocabulary to say that nothing "will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:39). Then in almost the next breath he says, "For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren" (Rom. 9:3). Togetherness is of the very essence of life, a togetherness created by God in Christ wherein we are made members one of another. Surely the church is more than a gathering of individuals. I cannot imagine St. Paul quitting the church because he didn't like some of its policies. He would agonize all the more to make it worthy. The church is a fellowship in which each member does his part to help every other member serve God. Some of our local church fellowships are sad and depressing. Some are penetrated with a Franciscan joy. I see much hope in the revival of the vital conception of the church as a living fellowship of loving souls, united in their Lord as their Head, finding their enriching source of life in membership in a body which is Christ's Body.

TRADITIONAL AND PERSONAL RELIGION

RALPH MARCUS
University of Chicago

In one of his novels Anatole France retells with facile irony the old story of an eastern king who on succeeding to his father's throne asked the greatest scholars of his country to compile for his guidance a history of mankind as complete as possible. After years of labor the scholars produced a history in hundreds of volumes. But meanwhile the king had grown considerably older and found their monumental history much too long for him to read. He therefore asked the wise men to condense it. Another decade passed and again they presented their work in a score of volumes. Again they were asked to condense. Before the final version could be made ready for the king, the king himself was ready for the grave. Lying on his deathbed he urgently asked the wisest of the scholars to tell him the story of mankind in one sentence. "Sire," replied the learned man, "they were born, they suffered, and they died."

This epitome of human history is rhetorically effective but philosophically unsatisfactory. We might reasonably suppose that a thoughtful king would have reflected that suffering and death are not peculiar to mankind but are the lot of all animals. We might further imagine his going on to ask how and why men suffer and in what respect their suffering is different from that of nonhuman animals, and finally what makes suffering endurable to so many men.

The story so rewritten would lose its dramatic appeal but it would gain a moral. The moral would be that just because men are born and suffer and die, they have formed beliefs about the meaning of life, and the expressions of these beliefs we call religion.

Here I shall attempt to give an account, as impersonal and simple as possible, of my own understanding of religion in general and of Judaism in particular. My hope is that the reader will make allowance for the awkward convention in modern English of capitalizing the pronoun of the first person singular, and will consider the frequently recurring "I" as being as unobtrusive as the uncapitalized "you" or "we." In trying to indicate what place religion has in my scheme of things I hope that others in the Judæo-Christian tradition will find it at least symptomatically interesting both for its resemblances to, and differences from, their own schemes of things.

"Know before Whom thou standest" said the rabbis. This I interpret in modern terms to mean that I should try to form some notion of God.

But the very existence of God is a problem which hundreds of eminent theologians have wrestled with, and their various proofs have been rejected by hundreds of equally eminent philosophers. What new insight or new device of logic can I miraculously find that will enable me to solve this problem to my own satisfaction at least, if not to others? It is with a mixture of admiration and skepticism that I view the attitude of one of our more self-confident dialecticians, Mortimer Adler, who writes in the *Thomist* (January, 1943, p. 194), "It is not contradictory to say that I affirm by faith that God's existence can be known to reason without recourse to faith." On this dialectic sleight of hand I can only comment that Professor Adler has taken an Irish bull by the two horns.

Much less confidently I offer my own dialectic formulation of the problem of God's existence. Either the word "God" has meaning, or it has not. If it has no meaning, there is no point in discussing it. If it has meaning, then either God exists or he does not exist. If he does not exist, it is impossible to prove his existence. If he does exist, there is no need to prove it.

The problem of the nature of God seems to me equally difficult to say anything meaningful about. The word "God" has a history in the English language going back to pre-Christian times. Its meaning or meanings must have changed radically when the Anglo-Saxons were converted to Christianity. Its meaning must have changed again when the Bible was translated into English. The same changes of meanings must be assumed in the Hebrew and Greek words which are translated as "God." Did the words *elohim, theos, deus, God* have the same meaning for Isaiah, Paul, Augustine, Spinosa, and thousands of other thinkers who have tried to describe the nature of God?

Such sincerely meant arguments are the only ones I can think of to console me for my inability to understand how theologians can describe the nature of God with so much certainty and authority, for example, when a contemporary Thomist says, "This primacy of intellect is seen analogously in God's own mind." To this bold assertion I can only reply, without any intention of being frivolous, "What is in God's mind, only God knows. What is in our own minds we do not fully know."

But the rabbinic injunction, "Know before Whom thou standest," or the Delphic counsel, "Know thyself," can be interpreted in still other ways. What is my relation to the universe and to my fellow men? What are the simple significant facts that I need to bear in mind when I try to see myself in historical and philosophical perspective? Some of them are the following. I am one of some two billion human beings who live on one of the smaller planets of a solar system that is one of an enormous

number of such systems known to exist in that part of the universe which our limited instruments have enabled us to explore. All these human beings, who die at the rate of more than a hundred thousand daily, belong to a single one of the hundreds of thousands of still living animal species, and this species of man has been in existence for only a small portion of the time during which the simplest animals have existed on earth. Of the five hundred thousand years that man has lived on earth, only in the last five thousand has he had the rudiments of civilization, and only in the second half of this last period were those doctrines formulated and those practices established which have come down to me in the religious tradition known as Judaism.

At this point I feel that I must take a stand in the long and unprofitable controversy between orthodox theologians on the one hand and natural and social scientists on the other. A neutral observer, if such could be found, would probably agree that the theologians have been more at fault than the scientists, and on a number of counts. In the first place, the theologians have had their own scientific theories about the creation of the world, the origin of civilization and other events, and when these theories have proved to be erroneous, they have bitterly resented being confronted with the evidence. Moreover, orthodox theologians want to eat their cake and still have it; they attempt to use reason to support their particular forms of faith, and then ungratefully dismiss reason as inferior to faith. In the third place, they unjustly accuse scientists of being "materialists" and of being responsible for the moral imperfections of mankind. In their charges of "materialism" they protest too much and thereby lay themselves open to suspicion of attaching more importance to matter than do the so-called "materialistic scientists." The morally weighted distinction which orthodox theologians and idealistic philosophers make between spirit and matter seems to lose its cosmic importance when we learn from modern physics that matter is only a congealed form of energy, and from modern psychosomatic medicine that body and mind are indistinguishably united. There is a Gnostic flavor about this idealistic-materialistic dualism. Perhaps Judæo-Christian theologians would do better to accept at their face value the common-sense words of Tertullian,[1] *"Quis enim negavit Deum corpus esse etsi Deus spiritus est?"*

About as futile as the controversy over spirit and matter, it seems to me, is that over the freedom of the human will. Theologians have argued for centuries that however great and all-pervasive is the power of God, and however fully he determines the course of events, man has a free will. Let us delicately pass over the philosophical problems involved in this

[1] *Adv. Praxean* 7.

thesis, and consider only the practical consequences of it. After arguing fiercely for the freedom of man's will, what do the theologians propose to make of that freedom? Their chief concern seems to be that we surrender our free will to God. "Not my will but thy will be done."

In making these criticisms of orthodox theologians I do not wish to minimize the sincerity and nobility of their motives in trying to formulate a faith that will give comfort to their troubled fellow men. My presumptuous criticism arises from a feeling that the theologians are secretly unsure of their faith in a personal God and in other doctrines of Judæo-Christian tradition. No sensitive and imaginative person will try to destroy his fellow's belief in a personal God when he pauses to reflect on man's loneliness and helplessness in a bewildering universe where "the eternal silence of the infinite spaces" frightened even so great a mind as Pascal's. But if a scientist or an unorthodox theologian has the courage to face a universe in which he sees no evidence of the existence of a kindly Father waiting to welcome him into eternal peace and joy, what principle of morality or religion authorizes a traditionalist to charge the agnostic with lack of faith? Greater faith than this has no man, that an agnostic lay down his life for his fellow men without hope of reward from a heavenly Father.

I remember having heard a few years ago a debate on the moral values of our civilization between a famous sociologist and a famous physicist. At the end of an emotional address that was more theological than scientific, the sociologist dramatically announced that he would choose to follow Saint Francis of Assisi rather than the materialistic scientists. I found myself sadly thinking that Saint Francis would have preferred the quiet reasonable physicist to the violent sociologist. Of course man should not and can not live by bread alone. But is not the eating of bread a sacrament? Too often do we hear the biblical admonition about living by the spirit of God and not by bread alone from so-called idealists who are much better provided with bread and other material goods than are the "materialistic" scientists whom they denounce.

As for the belief in personal immortality, as in the matter of belief in a personal God, I would think it wrong to try to break down the faith of simple and devout people who have been bereaved and find consolation in the hope of being reunited with lost loved ones in another life. But for myself I find no lasting comfort in this belief, at least in its naïve traditional form. What possible good can there be in the prolongation to eternity of such personalities as Nero or Hitler or the countless thousands of obscure criminals or congenitally insane or feeble-minded men whom their nearest kin could regard only with horror? And there is another

side to the traditional concept of "life after death" that disturbs me, namely, that it presupposes a spiritual and physical discontinuity between time as we know it and time (disguised as eternity) as it will be after death. Eternity is too great an idea and a value to be defined by death. Eternity is here and now.

So far I have been talking of theological beliefs that are essential, though not peculiar, to the Judæo-Christian tradition. In what follows I wish to record dissent on moral rather than philosophical grounds from two other doctrines that are of almost equal importance in this tradition, though they are probably more cherished in theory than honored in practice. For reasons of expediency I will mention only the Jewish form of the first doctrine, that of vicarious atonement. The classical expression of this doctrine is the passage in Isaiah 53 about the suffering servant, which Jewish exegesis has almost always interpreted as applying to the whole of Israel. To me this doctrine seems as deficient morally as it is sublime æsthetically, because I regard it as an excessive form of spiritual pride for one ethnic group to regard its suffering as atonement for the sins of all mankind. Common sense and enlightened morality require that every individual atone for his own sins or his own mistakes.

A second doctrine that I cannot honestly accept has not been explicitly formulated in the Old Testament or in rabbinic teaching, so far as I know, but has become part of the ethical theory of many modern Jews who have been impressed by Jesus' injunction, "Resist not evil" (which in the original Aramaic probably read, "Resist not an evil man"). This, incidentally, is one of the few sayings in the Sermon on the Mount which do not have obvious parallels in early rabbinic teaching. This same thought is expressed in slightly different form in the Socratic thesis, "It is better to be wronged than to do wrong." There are, of course, similar sayings in the wisdom literature of India and other countries. Here again our modern insight, based largely upon psychology, would require us to revise the ancient moral theory. If the "evil man" is merely a normal person who in momentary anger does us an injury, we may rightfully submit to the injury in the hope that by so doing we may cause him to see the error of his ways and establish even better relations with us than before. If, however, we are attacked or threatened by men who are incurably evil or criminally insane, like the SS men of the Nazis, we are morally bound to resist them and do them injury if possible. To take a more commonplace example, it is not only justifiable but also praiseworthy to fight a bully, since a courageous refusal to submit to his bullying is more likely to lead to his reformation than is passive submission. One must use common sense in deciding when to resist and when to submit. This is

what Jesus himself did, according to the gospels. He submitted to the Roman authorities but he forcibly drove the money-changers from the temple. This is what Socrates did. He submitted to the Athenian authorities but he took up arms against the states that were at war with Athens.

The reader who has had the patience to follow these personal criticisms of long honored Judæo-Christian traditions may wonder why the critic wishes to be regarded as an adherent of the Jewish faith. An explanation would have to be both personal and general, and it is precisely the interrelation of personal and general elements in my thinking that I venture to believe is symptomatically meaningful.

Each of us is born and continues to live in a great many anthropological classes, such as race, nation, religion, psychosomatic group, social and economic stratum, political party, territorial and linguistic area, occupational type, and so on. When we are dissatisfied with a particular class to which we must continue to belong by physical necessity, we soon decide that the sensible thing is to try to coöperate with others in that class in an effort to improve it. But there are also good reasons for continuing to belong to a class which we have the choice of leaving.

That men should be sorted into so many classes is not in itself a bad thing, providing that they recognize (as unfortunately most do not) that these classes, with the obvious exceptions of the biological ones such as race and sex, have been historically determined, whereas by nature all men are brothers. That this is no pious sentiment is clear to anyone who takes the trouble to translate it into biological terms and to see that it simply means that all living men belong to a single species of animal, namely, *homo,* in the family of *hominidæ* in the order of Primates. We can also make the brotherhood of man more immediately impressive by remembering that every human being is descended from more than a million ancestors twenty generations back, and that in the course of the countless generations that have lived since man emerged from the prehuman stage the ancestors of each of us must have mated with one another.

Nor is it in itself a bad thing that large groups of men are separated from one another by the barriers of race, nationality, religion, and the like, so long as these class concepts do not keep men from recognizing their kinship with those from whom they are so divided. Then, too, these associations give their members a feeling of solidarity that is very comforting in a world of conflicting human interests. That feeling of comfort, however, begins to be seriously disturbed when there is a conflict of interests between two of the several groups to which all men belong; for ex-

ample, between nationality and religion or between social and economic class and race.

The only permanent solution of the problem of conflicting loyalties is the universal recognition that no loyalty, whether to nation, race, religion, political party, economic class, or any other group, is as important as loyalty to the whole human race. Loyalty to mankind must be paramount, however sympathetic we may be to the needs of animals. For this biological chauvinism nature, not man, is ultimately responsible.

Now of all the historic classifications none is more inclusive and more consistently concerned with human brotherhood and with the relation of mankind to the universe than is religion. Nor does any class concept show a more sympathetic understanding of man's great emotional desires as well as of his daily physical needs.

That is why even the most skeptical and agnostic student of history may find it perfectly natural and proper to consider himself part of a traditional religious group. Let us be honest enough to admit that our conscious preferences for one religion over all others are rationalizations. If, for example, my Jewish parents had for some deplorable reason been forced to give me as an infant for adoption to a Christian or Muslim family, I should have grown up with the same intellectual and emotional attachment to one of these two religions that I now have to Judaism. Everyone whose memories of childhood are affectionately involved with religious observances in church and home and with the parables and examples drawn by his parents from their own childhood memories of religion, will naturally express his own religious emotions in these familiar forms.

There is no intellectual or moral harm in the fact that the religious affiliations of most people are based upon sentiment rather than reason, providing that we are reasonable enough to see the virtues of other religions and the imperfections of our own. The preference for the religion of one's ancestors is as natural and justifiable as the preference for the language of one's ancestors or country, but the one preference is no more divinely sanctioned than the other.

In deciding what attitude we should take toward those aspects of rival religions or denominations which we feel are hurtful to the cause of humanity as a whole, we need common sense and imagination, as we do in judging all social problems. If a Protestant or Jew feels that the hierarchic and authoritarian doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church are in conflict with the essentially democratic spirit of the Judæo-Christian tradition, he need not and should not fear to express criticism or opposition. But in so doing, he should recognize that many thoughtful Catholics are striving for greater liberalism and democracy in their own

faith and deserve sympathy and encouragement from outsiders. He should also make sure that he is equally candid and forceful in criticizing the reactionary groups in Judaism and Protestantism.

Nothing is more necessary than to distinguish between reasonable criticism and fanatical missionary zeal. The Protestant who condemns the Jew for refusing to accept the divinity of Jesus must be reminded that the Jew has the same inalienable right of conscientious objection that the Protestant claims for himself in refusing to accept the *ex cathedra* infallibility of the pope in matters of faith and morals or the worship of the Virgin Mary (which many historians of religion recognize as a survival of the pre-Christian worship of the mother goddess). One need not be an anthropologist to realize that one man's religion is another man's mythology or magic, and that religion, mythology, and magic are mixed together in varying proportions in every religious tradition.

We should not only beware of inherited prejudices against other faiths but should also beware of prejudices supposedly based upon rational grounds. The Christian theologian who confidently proclaims the moral superiority of Christianity to Judaism, and the Jewish theologian who takes the same attitude toward Christianity are not much different from two small boys who on meeting for the first time inform each other with more apparent than real conviction, "My father can lick your father." In this atomic age when every believer in the Judæo-Christian tradition is needed in the fight against political and economic tyranny, theologians of various denominations have no right to waste their time in fighting one another on such secondary issues.

Let me give two concrete examples of denominational snobbishness and self-righteousness, one taken from the Christian attitude, the other from the Jewish. Many Christian theologians claim that Christianity is morally superior to Judaism because Jesus emphasized the golden rule in its positive form, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," whereas his rabbinic contemporaries, notably Hillel, taught, "Do not do unto others what thou wouldst not have done unto thee." Such theologians overlook the fact that Hillel and his fellow rabbis were merely giving a motivation for the golden rule, with which all Jews were familiar from their knowledge of the Pentateuch. We find the same negatively formulated motivation of the golden rule in two early Christian sources, in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (5:14-15) and in the Didache (chap. 1).

The second example of denominational snobbishness, which is of a more theological nature, is to be found in the superior attitude of most Jews toward the doctrine of the Trinity. The oneness of God has always been the most sacred belief of Israelites and Jews, and the recitation of the *Shema* which states this belief has been given a central place in the Jewish

liturgy. But despite the impressive evidence of unitarianism in Judaism, it cannot be denied that there are traces, unapparent to most Jews and Christians, of a trinitarian pattern in rabbinic theology. To the Christian Trinity—God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit—there corresponds a Jewish trinity—God, Israel, and the Torah. In Judaism the collectivity of Israel has, in a psychological and religious-historical sense, almost the same position that the only-begotten Son of God has in Christianity.

This trinitarian pattern in Judaism, however, is not as systematically constructed as its Christian parallel, and it assumes slightly different forms in exegesis and liturgy, so that sometimes it is Israel, sometimes the Torah, that corresponds to Christ in the triune relation. For example, traditional Christianity dramatically symbolizes the mystery of the relation of God to man by the elevation of the Host in the Mass, which in simple terms means that God has become man. Traditional Judaism symbolizes this relation by the elevation of the scroll of the Torah after its removal from the ark in the synagogue, which in simple terms means that God has become revealed law. Parenthetically it may be noted that the name *Raḥmana,* "the Merciful One" (*i.e.,* God), is often applied by the rabbis to Scripture. Strictly speaking, this is a conventional abbreviation, but a psychologist will recognize that it is an unconscious identification of the Torah with God.

Let us go into these matters a little more deeply. In almost all comparative evaluations of Judaism and Christianity it is assumed that we are dealing with two easily distinguishable religious traditions. But in reality such names as Judaism and Christianity or Hellenism or Islam (if we include the two other important faiths of western culture) are misleading simplifications. They fail to indicate the stratifications that are in some ways—significant ways—more important than the primary distinctions. Within each of these four traditions there are at least four strata. From a psychological point of view there is greater similarity between the corresponding strata of these four religions than between the different strata of the same religion. To illustrate, in each of the four traditions, Hellenism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, there is a scholastic, a mystic, an institutional, and a popular stratum (one might add a Gnostic, but it is of secondary importance in this connection). No one who is familiar with the literature of mysticism can fail to be impressed by the remarkable similarity of Greek, Jewish, Christian, and Muslim mysticism. Except for the historical differences of divine names, sources of revelation, and ceremonial forms, the descriptions of the mystical experiences of Greek, Jew, Christian, and Muslim are identical. In the same way the thought patterns of the scholastic strata of the four traditions are basically identical. This fact has been succinctly stated by one of the most learned of con-

temporary historians of philosophy, Professor H. A. Wolfson, as follows:

> The same Greek terminology lay behind the Arabic, Hebrew and Latin terminology, and the same scientific and philosophical conceptions formed the intellectual background of all those who philosophized in Arabic, Hebrew or Latin. The three philosophic literatures are in fact one philosophy expressed in different languages, translatable almost literally into one another.[2]

In stressing these horizontal similarities I do not mean to minimize the vertical differences. Certainly Christian mystics, scholastics, clerics, and laymen are usually more conscious of their common Christianity than of the similarity in belief or attitude of their particular group to the corresponding group in Judaism or Islam. But the cross correspondences undeniably exist and are of undeniable importance to all those who have an understanding of historical perspective and a concern for human brotherhood.

In general it is the ignorant and superstitious group in every tradition that is most bitterly hostile to all groups in other religions, and is often distrustful of more enlightened groups in its own religion. The informed and thoughtful Christian, Jew, or Muslim is more likely to see the good in rival traditions.

After considering religious tradition in general, I venture to speak now of my personal religion in the hope that my own experience may be of interest to others because it is, as all personal experience must be in large part, merely typical. I shall try to explain why someone like myself who has become acquainted with several religious and cultural traditions, and belongs to the naturalistic school of thought (though, like all other abstractions, "naturalism" includes a number of concepts common to rival schools) remains within the Jewish fold. Let me say in passing that I cannot here deal with the further complications resulting from the ethnic-cultural aspects of Judaism, which are not easily separable from the religious.

Having earlier admitted that it is chiefly sentiment that keeps me loyal to Judaism (however unorthodox my kind of Juadism would be considered by most of my coreligionists), I should like to explain why I think that this sentiment deserves to be respected by even the most agnostic as well as the most devout people, whether Jewish or Christian. I would be the last to claim that the Israelites of the biblical period and the Jews of the talmudic and modern periods were and are a community of saints. It is true that we Jews are the descendants of the prophets (in spite of considerable racial admixture), but we are also the descendants of the Israelites who were severely castigated by the prophets. Nevertheless, it can honestly be said that Jewish moral values in theory and practice have

[2] H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinosa,* Cambridge, 1934, vol. i, p. 10.

been consistently high, partly because a system of compulsory religious education has existed among the Jews since the time of Ezra, and partly because Judaism is as much a religion of the home as of the synagogue. Moreover, through the struggle for survival in a hostile environment Judaism has become specialized in such a way as to encourage those social and personal values which western culture regards as highly desirable. This is not to deny that Jews may possess some qualities which are regarded as undesirable in western culture. But no one can fairly expect a Jew to reject the traditions of his fathers because his fathers were not all saints.

By remaining Jewish I need not and do not deprive myself of the values that other religions and cultures can offer me. Of course I do not believe that all the religious insight and poetry and moral sublimity of which the human soul is capable are to be found only in the Old Testament and in rabbinic and later Jewish literature. Neither are they to be found only in the religious literature or practice of any other single tradition, or in all of them together, or even in the combined religious and secular literature and customs of the whole of mankind from antiquity to the present day. Mankind has not yet exhausted the religious mysteries of the universe.

Conversely, there is enough wisdom and religious insight for a lifetime in a single book of the Old Testament, as there is in a single work of Plato or Augustine or Spinosa or Pascal or Goethe or Emerson or any other of a thousand religious and philosophical geniuses. Wisdom is where one finds it.

The wisdom and poetry of the Hebrew prophets, psalmists, historians, and their rabbinic successors have had an irresistible attraction for all men of understanding who have known them. For Jews they have had a particularly powerful attraction because Jews have known them better and have felt a spiritual kinship with their authors. There is a continuity of emotional and intellectual experience that is as strong as the continuity of race. The dynamic force of the Jewish tradition is increased by the insistent memory of the many generations who have found strength and healing in the words of these ancient Hebrew writers who looked into their hearts and wrote.

To me as to many others there are two books in the Hebrew scriptures that seem to reach the limits of human understanding of the meaning of life. One is the book of Job, the other Ecclesiastes. I shall try to indicate in the fewest possible words how these two classics of Hebrew wisdom have the most direct and genuine relevance to the spiritual needs of individuals in an age of social transformation.

The author of Job is not, I think, primarily concerned with the prob-

lem of the suffering of righteous men nor with the problem of the existence of evil in a universe supposedly governed by a benevolent and omnipotent God. Job is indignant and bitter, not merely because God allows him to suffer, but because the Almighty seems to be going out of his way to crush a helpless human being who has tried to do what he thinks God expects of him. Thereupon God turns upon Job in exasperation and tries to make him understand that he, the Almighty, has his hands full trying to control the demonic forces of the universe (why these forces were created the author does not attempt to explain, and very wisely). This tremendous cosmic task leaves God little time to attend to Job's personal suffering, however sincerely he may deplore it. Let Job gird up his loins like a man (or like God himself) and let his own right hand save him. The book of Job is a triumphant affirmation of humanity's need to emulate God's unconquerable will.

A like essential wisdom is taught in Ecclesiastes. To regard this book as the work of a disillusioned sage or cynic or to explain the expressions of hopefulness and piety that alternate with expressions of realistic resignation as "orthodox glosses" is to misunderstand the author and the lessons of human experience. More discerningly than most theologians and biblical critics has the American novelist Thomas Wolfe interpreted the message of Ecclesiastes.[3] Because Wolfe had an insatiable hunger for knowledge and poetic experience, because he had a tormenting desire to read all the great books ever written, to eat all the fine food ever prepared, to make love to all the beautiful women he might meet, because he knew the pain of hunger and the ecstasy of renunciation, he saw clearly and felt poignantly that the author of Ecclesiastes was a great lover of life. "For of all that I have ever seen or learned, that book seems to me the noblest, the wisest and the most powerful expression of man's life upon this earth." Romantic curiosity about experience comes easily to inexperienced youth, but that the author of Ecclesiastes, who knew the vanity and brevity of worldly ambition, the monotony of natural events and human activity, the little advantage of man over beast in the manner of his life and death—that such a man should yet take pleasure in the beauty of wisely ordered moments and see how right it is for man to enjoy the simple pleasures that God has given him to enjoy, and should urge man to do with all his might whatsoever his hand finds to do, "for there is no work nor device nor knowledge in the grave"—that is a marvelous achievement.

That this realistic, often ironic and yet indignant, attitude toward the unreasonableness of life should coexist with an invincible desire to find life good, as God was believed to have found the world good after creating it, seems to me to be a peculiar virtue of the Jewish mind and temper.

[3] Thomas Wolfe, *You Can't Go Home Again,* New York, 1940, chap. 47. The chapter is inadvertently titled "Ecclesiasticus."

When Margaret Fuller, the New England Transcendentalist, somewhat dramatically announced, "I accept the universe," Carlyle's sardonic comment was, "Gad, she'd better." The authors of Job and Ecclesiastes and most other Jewish thinkers combine within themselves the sardonic resignation of Carlyle and the exultant hopefulness of Margaret Fuller. This is their peculiar distinction as a group. One may find a resolute philosophy of yea saying or *quand-même* in other traditions, but in none, I think, so consistently and conspicuously as in Judaism. Most Jewish thinkers accept the universe, not passively or resentfully, but with a mixture of indignation, gratitude, and determination to improve it. Like the author of the Gospel of John the rabbis believed that God dearly loved the world, but whereas the evangelist expressed this divine love in the sublimely pathetic and sublimely daring thought that God sent his only-begotten beloved Son into the world to make atonement for man's sins, the rabbis expressed it in the more disciplined thought that God sent his only-begotten beloved Torah into the world to teach men how to make an end of sin by conquering themselves.

When we come down from the heights of speculation to the immediately felt problems that crowd upon each one of us from the background of a bewildering universe and the foreground of a terrifying world of fellow human beings, we need all the insights of religion, philosophy, and science and all the resources that man has found in centuries of laborious and anxious search. Gnomic wisdom is not enough. But gnomic wisdom rightly interpreted and expanded can do much, wonderfully much, to make life understandable and enjoyable in spite of frustration and pain.

Of all the gnomic sayings that have been given to mankind by inspired thinkers there can be few more prophetically revealing and enduringly valid than that of Hillel, "If I am not for myself, who is for me? And if I am for myself alone, what am I?" This saying can be interpreted and expanded in a number of meaningful and helpful ways. In this concluding portion of my imperfectly constructed exposition of traditional and personal religion I shall try to point out as briefly as possible some of the many religious and philosophical meanings that radiate from this bright conceptual centre.

One of its meanings is that the human will and mind can transcend the limits of biology. Nature has subordinated the welfare of the individual animal to the welfare of the species. But by giving human animals self-consciousness, nature has also given the human individual the possibility of varying the relation of his own self to the selves of others of his species. If a man's own immediate and temporary pain is more distressing to him than the more serious sufferings of large numbers of his fellow men, it is not his fault but the fault of nature, which has made him a single and

separate organism. However deeply and sensitively a man tries to understand and lighten the suffering of his fellows, he cannot bring about a biological transference of feeling. But he can bring about a partial transference through conceptual and verbal symbols.

Man cannot alter the physiological basis of his egocentrism but he can modify it and alter its natural functions, just as he can change his perspective without being able to achieve more than normal vision. He can change his ego from a permanent to a movable centre so that while other men remain points on his horizon or in his field of vision, he becomes aware that he is only a point on the horizons or in the fields of vision of other men. In this way he maintains his individuality but restricts it to its proper place. He need never forget that he is an individual but must always remember that he is only an individual.

Another thing that Hillel's saying means is that there is no mutually exclusive relation between self-interest and altruism, but that altruism is a part of self-interest. It converts the golden rule from a vaguely apprehended counsel of perfection into a sound practical rule of social psychology. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" comes to mean that everyone should consider his fellow as a human being with the same mixture of virtues and imperfections as himself, and also that he should naturally and gradually extend the range of his emotional attachment to include not only his immediate kin but also his fellow human beings as a whole.

In the brief interval since the miraculous feat of splitting the atom has become common knowledge, moralists and theologians have understandably yielded to the temptation to use the phrase "smashing the atom" in a symbolic sense. Yielding to the same temptation, I would say that man must learn to smash his ego as effectively as he has learned to smash the atom. But this metaphorical use of the phrase should be qualified by the observation that the ego differs in one important respect from the still hypothetical atom. When the nucleus of the atom is split, both the atom and its uncounted neighbor atoms disappear from our sense perception. But one may split the ego and release a relatively great amount of spiritual power without destroying the ego. We have to learn the technique of a new science, a kind of moral physics, that will enable us to use the spiritual power of the ego over and over again for the good of all mankind.

In this way we can profit most fully from the insights of traditional religion, and every man can work out his own personal religion in harmony with tradition. Gnomic wisdom is not an end but a beginning of the religious transformation of mankind.

Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast
Erwirb es um es zu besitzen.

THE THEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF TRANSLATION

JAN N. SEVENSTER
University of Amsterdam

LUTHER once said: "Theology is grammar" *(Theologie ist Grammatik)*. One is reminded of this word when he compares different translations of the New Testament. Some time ago the new *Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* was sent to me by Dr. Cadbury, who had been one of my teachers at Harvard Divinity School. This new version interested me the more, since in our country, too, a new translation of the New Testament was completed seven or eight years ago, through the coöperation of scholars from different churches. It was edited by the Dutch Bible Society. This is the first translation to gain wide acceptance since the classic Dutch version, the *Statenvertaling* of 1637, which was authorized by the Synod of Dort (Dordrecht) in 1618-1619 and confirmed by the States-General. The latter has been for our people for centuries what Luther's Bible has been for the German people.

All these versions are, of course, translations from the original Greek. Now it is interesting to notice some of the differences between these translations old and new. Many of the differences, of course, have no importance except for those who make special study of these matters. But there are others whose importance is by no means limited to the technical expert. I want to point out some of these latter in connection with three Greek words in the New Testament: *doulos* (slave, servant), *psyche* (soul, life), *entos* (within, in the midst of). Let us indicate the different translations by the following abbreviations: *L.* for the German Version of Luther (1522), *St.* for the old Dutch translation, the *Statenvertaling* (1637), *D.* for the Dutch version of the Dutch Bible Society (1938), and *R.S.* for the *Revised Standard Version* (1946). In my comparison of the four versions with reference to these three words, I shall not attempt to examine all the passages in which they occur, but only those where a comparison reveals the theological importance of translation.

First, the word *doulos*. As far as I have traced it, the old versions, *L.* and *St.*, render this word constantly by "servant" *(L.: Knecht, St.: dienstknecht)*. The modern versions do not translate it consistently by the same word. In some places they translate it "servant," in others "slave." And they do not agree in their preference of the one or the other. As Mr. Enslin has already pointed out in his review of the *R.S.* in this

journal,[1] the *R.S.* generally renders "servant." But in I Cor. 7:21-23 it renders "slave," and sometimes, as in the Pauline salutations, when it translates "servant," in a footnote is said: "Or slave."[2] But on the whole *doulos* is rendered by "servant." One of the characteristics, on the contrary, of *D.* as against *St.* is that for the most part it translates *doulos* by "slave" *(slaaf)*. So, to cite a few examples, in the parable of the Talents the man going on a journey called his "slaves"[3]; in the parable of the Wicked Husbandman the owner of the vineyard sends at first "slaves" to the tenants[4]; the man going on a journey puts his "slaves" in charge[5]; in Gethsemane the "slave" of the high priest was struck.[6] But in the passages mentioned above where *R.S.* gives the choice between "servant" and "slave," *D.* translates "servant" *(dienstknecht)*.

In this case, I think, preference ought to be given to the translation, "slave." And some passages of the New Testament convey far more to the modern reader if we read "slave." The parable of the Servant's Wages,[7] like that of the Laborers in the Vineyard,[8] is very important for the question, What did Jesus think about the grace of God? This parable demonstrates clearly that a man never has any claim to reward from God, just as that of the Laborers in the Vineyard shows that the reward never can be calculated. God is always Sovereign. If he gives to us his good gifts, he does it out of his generosity. But no man has any rights as toward him. He is allowed to do what he chooses. So we have no ground for complaint if he does to us what we did not expect. Even if we have done all that was our duty, we have no claim to God's gifts. We live by grace always. Now the impudence of a man who is calculating with God is much more clearly revealed if we read "slave" in the parable of Luke 17:7-10, and know what the position of a slave in antiquity was. He was not free, was not even a hired servant, but was the property of his master. I got what was perhaps my first impression of the difference between "slave" and "servant" when I read as a boy *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, of course in a Dutch translation. (This is no covert thrust at you Americans, because I remember all too well that my ancestors became rich shipping slaves from Africa. We have lost those riches now.) If a slave came in from the field after having spent the day plowing or keeping sheep, he could not say: "Now I am going to eat," as if he had earned his meal. No, if his master had other work for him, he would have no rest and no meal at all. He had to continue his tiresome drudging with no

[1] *Crozer Quarterly*, XXIII (July, 1946), p. 272.
[2] Rom. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; so also Gal. 1:10; Col. 4:12.
[3] Matt. 25:14.
[4] Mark 12:2, 4.
[5] Mark 13:34.
[6] Mark 14:47; here *R.S.* also renders "slave."
[7] Luke 17:7-10.
[8] Matt. 20:1-16.

claim to reward. Are not the doctrine of grace and the agreement between Jesus and Paul in this respect much better illustrated by this parable, if *doulos* is here rendered "slave"?

And does not the relation in which Paul and the members of the first Christian communities felt themselves to Christ stand out much clearer if we understand that they called themselves "slaves of Christ"? From the many inscriptions found at Delphi in Greece we know exactly how slaves were sometimes freed. Officially the god Apollo bought a slave from his former master with a sum of money which had really been paid to the temple by the slave himself and handed to his master.[9] By these inscriptions new light is thrown on texts like I Cor. 6:20 and 7:23. But they enable us too to understand the overwhelming joy of Paul and his fellow Christians when they knew themselves free from the old yoke of slavery, since they were slaves, the property, of Christ, who had bought them with a price. And now they lived in absolute obedience to their new owner. Henceforth they belonged to him, and this they had to show in their lives. They are not their own any more. Body and soul, they are united to the Lord. All these thoughts were at once self-evident to men in the ancient world, as soon as they heard that word *doulos* in the fullness of its meaning. And they are conveyed more clearly to the modern reader if the word is rendered "slave."

The translation of the second word which I mentioned, *psyche*, is far more satisfactory in the *R.S.* than in the Dutch versions and that of Luther. In *D.* the word "life" is much more frequent for *psyche* than in the old versions, *St.* and *L.* For example, *St.* has "soul" in Matt. 2:20 ("those who sought the child's *soul*"), in Mark 10:45 ("For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his *soul* as a ransom for many"), in Matt. 10:39 ("He who finds his *soul* will lose it, and he who loses his *soul* for my sake will find it"), or in Luke 21:19 ("Possess [*St.* takes the verb as an imperative] your *souls* in patience"). In all these cases *D.* renders "life" as the *R.S.* does. But the latter has the translation "life" where the former has still the word "soul" in accordance with *St.* and *L.*, for instance, in the well-known saying of Jesus: "For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and do damage to his soul."[10] In the preceding verse it renders "life," as the *R.S.* does: "For whoever would save his *life* will lose it; and whoever loses his *life* for my sake and the gospel's will save it." This translation of the word *psyche* has apparently not been a problem for the English versions. The only older English version which I have at hand, the *Revised Version* of the

[9] A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 1923, pp. 271 ff. [E.T., pp. 326 ff.].
[10] Mark 8:36.

British and Foreign Bible Society of 1904, reads "life" in all places, mentioned above, where *St.* renders "soul," except in Luke 21 : 19, where it translates: "In your patience ye shall win your *souls.*"

This difference in translation, soul—life, is theologically not without importance. When the great German scholar, Adolf von Harnack, delivered his lectures on "the Essence of Christianity" for students in all faculties at the University of Berlin during the winter semester of 1899-1900, he summarized the preaching of Jesus under three headings: 1. the kingdom of God and its coming, 2. God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul, 3. the higher righteousness and the commandment of love. And the first is combined closely with the second, when it is said of the kingdom of God that it is the reign of the holy God in separate souls, that in the preaching of Jesus all outward expectations of the future did not really matter, but that it centres entirely in God and the soul, the soul and its God.[11] According to Harnack the kingdom of God and its coming, God the Father, and the infinite value of the soul of man even coalesce, "for ultimately the kingdom is nothing but the treasure which the soul possesses in the eternal and merciful God."[12]

Whence this doctrine of the infinite value of the soul? Properly speaking, Harnack has only one text to refer to, Mark 8: 36, which he translates in accordance with Luther: "What does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and do damage to his soul?" *(Was hülfe es dem Menschen, so er die ganze Welt gewönne und nähme doch Schaden an seiner Seele?*). This putting the infinite value of the soul into the centre of the gospel is possible, I think, only by giving a false interpretation to Mark 8: 36. And the rendering "soul" is apt to start one here on the wrong track. The verse deals, as is shown by the preceding one, with two sorts of life, this life and the life to come. What does it profit a man, to gain the whole world in this life and forfeit the life to come? Another explanation is sometimes given: What do all the goods of this world profit a man when he must die? According to this interpretation the greed of a man would be made ridiculous here as it is in the parable of the Rich Fool.[13] But however that may be, it is certainly wrong to emphasize the word *psyche* as "soul" and thus derive from it the notion of the infinite value of the soul. *Psyche* means here too, as in so many other places of the New Testament, "life."

It is important to notice this, because the translation "soul" in Mark 8: 36 and other places has seemed to support the opinion that the infinite

[11] A. von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums,* 1915, 33, 36 [E. T., *What Is Christianity?* pp. 55, 66 f.].
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 49 [E. T., pp. 83 f.].
[13] Cf. R. Bultmann, *Jesus,* Berlin, p. 51.

value of the soul is a central idea in the gospel. And this opinion has had sometimes noticeable consequences. If that estimation of the soul is really central in the New Testament, then the gospel seems to be concerned especially with the soul, the personal, inner life. So it would frame a pietistic view of the religious life and a separation of the inner life and life in the world. And in this latter sense it was sometimes very welcome to those who did not like the idea that the gospel had anything to do with their everyday life. Troeltsch, the well-known German theologian, tells about a German farmer, who said once: "The ministers should visit the sick, they should pray for the dead, but they should leave the healthy alone."[14] Ideas like these seem to be international. In one of the novels of George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss,* it was Mr. Tulliver's considered opinion that "church was one thing and common sense another, and he wanted nobody to tell him what common sense was." Nor do these views belong only to the past. That same separation between the inner life of the soul, according to the gospel, and the life in the world sounds very familiar to us, since we heard officially during five years nothing else than the Nazi propaganda. The Nazi party was officially a Christian party. In its program, among other things it was said: "We require the liberty of all religious convictions in the state, as far as they do not endanger the preservation of the state or conflict with the moral sense of the German race. The party as such stands on the ground of a positive Christianity, without binding itself to a special confession." "Liberty of all religious convictions . . . positive Christianity"—that seemed rather a source of hope for the Christian churches, and it was continually sounded to us as such, but if we had not known before, we pretty soon learned through experience that the German meant by those words something entirely different from what a Christian church meant and had to mean by it.

On the whole the Nazis had a small Bible. I have struggled once through the 781 pages of Hitler's *Mein Kampf,* a book something like the Bible for the German people, called by Goering the constitutional law of National Socialism. It deals with all kinds of subjects, but the only explicit allusion to the gospel which I found in it was the story of the Cleansing of the Temple. That looked a little like Nazi business, especially when Jesus belonged to the fair Aryan race, as they asserted in accordance with Houston Stewart Chamberlain in his *Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* That reference to the Cleansing of the Temple was the only trait of the "positive Christianity" in this bible of the Third Reich. So the Nazis always made a very special selection from the gospel. When a

[14] E. Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften,* II, p. 91—*"Die Geistlichen sollen die Kranken besuchen, für die Toten sollen sie beten, aber die Gesunden sollen sie in Ruhe lassen."*

minister was examined by the Gestapo, this positively Christian police always showed their thorough knowledge of the gospel by reminding the defendant of those words of Jesus: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." They did not always betray their knowledge of the following words, "and to God the things that are God's." They had often to be reminded of these by the defendant.

The Nazis always pretended that there was not the slightest danger of a conflict between church and state, if the church really confined itself to the things which concerned her, the life of the soul, the inner life, and the life hereafter. According to the Nazis, the churches had complete liberty to preach whatever they wanted if only they confined themselves to their own field and did not meddle with matters where the omnipotence of the state was concerned. When the churches protested openly against the discrimination of race, against the persecution of the Jews, against all kinds of injustice, this was decried as a political intrusion. The church had to take care of the individual souls of its members amidst the sorrows of this life and be concerned with the life hereafter. That was the special task of the church. The state and only the state had to take to heart worldly affairs.

It is clear that such ideas could easily arise when the centre of the gospel was seen in "God and the soul, the soul and its God." And that this was possible was largely due to interpreting Mark 8:36 as speaking of the soul and its infinite value.

The other reason why this interpretation may be important theologically is this: if one reads "soul" here, he may see in this text support for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It was often thought that this was an undoubtedly Christian doctrine. Then this text (Mark 8:36) was combined, for instance, with that other one, where *psyche* certainly has to be rendered "soul," as it is indeed in all versions: "Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the *soul;* rather fear him who can destroy both *soul* and body in hell."[15] In this latter saying is not the soul supposed to live on, and, if one combines this statement with that of Mark 8:36, does it not seem to follow that the soul lives on for that special reason, that it has an infinite value? If this were really the meaning, it would be about the same as that of the Greek-hellenistic idea of the immortality of the soul: the body as the earthly remains is of no real importance, but the soul, the precious inner part of man, is worth living on eternally.

In my judgment this is not the right interpretation, and one is easily deceived as to the meaning of Matt. 10:28 if he starts from the

[15] Matt. 10:28.

wrong translation of *psyche* as "soul" in Mark 8:36. It is a Greek-hellenistic idea, indeed, to regard the soul as the immortal part of man. In many writings of Plato the soul is called immortal and the doctrine was held in the time of the New Testament, for instance by the hellenistic Jewish writer, Philo of Alexandria. It presupposes a special view of the relation of soul and body. The body is the prison of the soul. At death the soul is finally delivered from this prison, for which deliverance it has longed during the whole of life. The soul is the precious, external part of man, akin to God.

Now these notions are often read into the gospel. Matt. 10:28 seems to support them, especially if it is read in the light of the wrong translation of Mark 8:36. Indeed, even according to the gospel the soul is able to live on after death. But it is an absolute misinterpretation of the words of Jesus to ascribe to him on the ground of this text the Greek-hellenistic doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The illegitimacy of such ascription is evident from the words: "rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell." They are sufficient to prove that the soul is not for Jesus the precious, imperishable part of man over against the perishable body. The soul is not in itself of such infinite value that it cannot perish; no, God is the only Soverign. He alone can preserve and destroy both soul and body as he pleases. That it is wrong to lay stress here on the eternal value of the soul in itself, is proved too by the parallel in Luke: "I tell you, my friends, do not fear those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; yes, I tell you, fear him!"[16] The point which receives the emphasis here is: after death men can do no more. Then a man is completely in the hands of God—completely, soul and body. And what is going to become of both depends solely on the will of God. This view is entirely different from the pathos of the Greek-hellenistic idea of the immortality of the soul. What an English commentator says about Paul: "The Pauline hope is not the Platonist hope of a release from the shackle and sepulchre of the body, not the hope of the survival of an immortal principle in man, but the hope of the endurance of the man himself," applies as well, I think, to Jesus.[17]

The translation of the third Greek word which I mentioned above, *entos,* concerns one text alone, Luke 17:20 f.: "Being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, he answered them, 'The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they

[16] Luke 12:4, 5.
[17] A. Plummer, *ICC II Corinthians,* p. 164.

say, "Lo, here it is!" or "There!" for behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you.'" The *R.S.* says in a footnote to "in the midst of": "Or *within.*" The *Revised Version* of the British and Foreign Bible Society of 1904 reads: "within you." So do *L.* and *St.* (Luther: *inwendig in euch; Statenvertaling: binnen ulieden*). *D.* Translates: "with you" *(bij u)*. Thus the older versions understand this verse as if the kingdom of God were something within men. This interpretation has been given to the word from the beginning. The first witness to it is probably a gnostic Oxyrhynchus papyrus (654:3), which reads: "The kingdom of heaven is within you, and he, who knows himself, shall find it." Since the papyrus is damaged, we cannot be entirely sure that this is the right reading; but the allusion to Luke 17:21 is clear, and it is probably combined with some view of the inner life of man. Other witnesses of this use of the text are, for instance, Thomas à Kempis in his *Imitatio Christi* (beginning of the second book) and Luther. The former, after having cited this text, exhorts his readers to turn themselves to the Lord, to despise outward things, and to give their heart to the inward ones. Then they shall see coming the kingdom of God within themselves. And Luther interprets this verse in the margin of his *Septembertestament:* "The kingdom of God does not concern works but faith and love."

Is this interpretation of *entos* as meaning "within" right? If it were, it would be the only support in the gospels for the view of the kingdom as something inward. And if men have a preference for this idea, they often quote these words of Jesus. Tolstoy made use of this text for the title of one of his books. And in every age there have been mystics who have been especially fond of this word, but only if it meant "within."

In itself the word *entos* can, I think, have both meanings: "within" or "in the midst of." It occurs only twice in the New Testament, here and Matt. 23:26, where it indicates the inside (of the cup). Usage of the word outside the New Testament shows that it can mean "inside" [18] as well as "in the midst of."[19] The question is therefore whether it is probable that it means "within" in Luke 17:21. To this it must be said that it is quite improbable on the ground of what is said elsewhere in the gospel about the kingdom of God. And on the other hand, the rendering "in the midst of you" fits perfectly into the whole preaching of the kingdom. This preaching is always closely connected with the person of Jesus Christ, his work, his doing, his healing. So Jesus, in reply to the Pharisees who were asking when the kingdom of God was coming, here says: It is already in the midst of you. [The very fact that this is an answer to the

[18] Josephus, *B. J.* iii, 175; vii, 26.
[19] Xenophon, *Hell.* ii, 3, 19; *Anab.* i, 10, 3.

Pharisees makes the meaning "within you" quite improbable.] I am preaching among you; I am healing the sick. Therefore you have no longer any need to look for special signs of its coming. If I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you.[20] According to the gospels the kingdom has come already in Jesus Christ himself, although it will come in its full glory in God's own good time, and in a way known only to God. So the parables of the Mustard Seed and of the Leaven[21] do not speak, as is often thought, about an inward growing and a gradual evolution of the kingdom. What they say is that the beginning of the coming of the kingdom has already taken place, in Christ, but that it is yet to come in its overwhelming greatness. It is therefore a wrong interpretation of these parables, I think, when in an American book it is said: "Impressive and substantial as are its [*i.e.*, the kingdom of God's] outward manifestations, it develops from within as the plant from the seed, as the leaven in the lump. It spreads by the contact of spirit with spirit. Outward change may smooth the way for its advent, but it is an inward experience."[22] One never sees the true meaning of the kingdom, as proclaimed in the gospels, if he neglects this close connection between its coming and Jesus Christ himself as the mighty revelation of God. So it is clear, that the translation of Luke 17:21 has determined in no small measure the quite different modern, inner or social, interpretations of the kingdom of God.

Thus these three examples, *doulos, psyche, entos,* illustrate clearly, I think, the importance for theology of a right translation and the danger of drawing wrong theological conclusions from a wrong rendering. Therefore the importance of careful translation can hardly be overestimated. And because Christian theology has its centre in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, it has to listen first of all to the exact meaning of the words of the New Testament. An Old Testament scholar once defined the task of exegesis of the Bible in these words: "to set forth and present in this day the literature of the past as it was meant by its authors and understood by its original hearers, or, better said, as they should have understood it."[23] This exact understanding, expressed as accurately as possible in the translation, must precede the theological elaboration of the data of the New Testament. If it does not, the danger of a theological derailment is always imminent.

[20] Matt. 12:28.
[21] Matt. 13:31-33.
[22] W. A. Brown, *The Church in America,* New York, 1922, p. 165
[23] A. Weiser, "Die theologische Aufgabe der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," in *Werden und Wesen des alten Testaments* (Beiheft 66 *zur ZAW*), 1936, p. 208.

W. ROBERTSON SMITH, HERETIC

JAMES B. PRITCHARD
Crozer Theological Seminary

It has been a century since William Robertson Smith was born and over a half century since his untimely death; yet, time and again his views are referred to in contemporary books, particularly those on the sociology and the history of religion. One of his books, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites,* remains, after fifty-seven years, a classic; it has appeared in three English editions and has been translated into German. Upon this work and the less widely known, but equally important, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia,* Robertson Smith's scientific fame rests. To these important contributions, so original and fresh in their approach to old problems, we shall return later.

In the 1880's this scholar in the field of Semitic religion, to quote from the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* was the most popular man in Scotland. At that time his fame rested not primarily upon his scholarly contributions, but was due to the fact that he had been declared a heretic by the Free Church of Scotland. The circumstances which led to this transitory fame not only shed light upon the development of the higher critical movement in the English-speaking world, but are of importance for an understanding of the perennial conflict between the creative minority and the mimesis of the less original masses. The observance of the centenary of the birth of W. Robertson Smith, even in this very modest fashion, recalls an interesting chapter in the struggle for academic freedom in theological schools; it is of interest, too, to see a man whose thoroughness in the mastery of the most technical details of his own chosen field did not preclude that breadth of knowledge which justly entitled him to qualify as the librarian of Cambridge University and as editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

Robertson Smith cannot be understood apart from the Free Church to which he remained loyal even after it had rejected him as one unfit to teach its ministers. Chronologically the life of the Free Church almost coincides with the life of its most notable heretic. Three years before his birth the Free Church came into existence; six years after his death the Free Church surrendered its autonomy and became a part of the United Free Church of Scotland. The immediate cause for the disruption in the Church of Scotland, which gave birth to the Free Church in 1843, was interference by the state in ecclesiastical matters. Resentful over the intrusion of a secular power, the nonintrusion party of the Church of Scotland withdrew in a body from the General Assembly on May 18, 1843, to

form the first assembly of the Free Church, of which Dr. Thomas Chalmers was moderator. Five days later, 396 ministers and professors placed their names to the Act of Separation and thus voluntarily surrendered an annual income estimated at £ 100,000. Beginning with nothing but courage and conviction for their cause, this group of Free Church ministers was able to provide for their loyal followers more than seven hundred churches within four years. For the most part, this courageous group which broke with the Church of Scotland held to an evangelical theology, and in a deeper sense the disruption was a protest against the prevalent rationalism of the earlier part of the nineteenth century.

W. Robertson Smith was born into this courageous, evangelical group. His father, Pirie Smith, left the principalship of a prosperous school in Aberdeen to become a minister of the Free Church at Keig and Tough in 1845. A year later, on November 8, 1846, William Robertson was born at Keig. The first fifteen years of his life were spent in the manse presided over by the former schoolmaster, who undertook singlehanded the education of his children. It was a rigid discipline in the study of the classics, both Latin and Greek, mathematics, of family prayers, and of "rational conversation." At the age of fifteen William took the Bursary Competition and came off with a scholarship of £ 30 for college.

At this early age he entered the University of Aberdeen. There he seems to have done so well, despite poor health, that in 1865 he was awarded the degree of Master of Arts and the Town Council Gold Medal. In 1866 he entered New College, Edinburgh, where he came under the influence of Dr. A. B. Davidson, professor of Hebrew language and Old Testament exegesis; possibly through Professor Davidson he first became acquainted with higher criticism as it was then being formulated in German universities. At the end of his first year (1867) Smith went to Germany, settled in Bonn, where he attended lectures by Kamphausen, Köhler, and Lange. During this period of his study he was strictly orthodox, but he was not without sympathy for the teaching of Kamphausen. "... it is quite absurd," he said, "to regard the heterodox Germans as infidels. Of course I do not mean that such men as Strauss [David Friedrich] are not infidels."[1] His second German summer was spent in Göttingen, where he found Ritschl congenial to his own views.

The first experience at teaching came to Robertson Smith in the year 1868-1869, when he became assistant to Professor P. G. Tait in physics at the University of Edinburgh. During the early years of his career Smith was known as widely for his contributions in the field of physics as in theology, and could easily have directed his genius in that direction. Five of his scientific papers have been published; one of these,

[1] J. S. Black and G. Chrystal, *The Life of William Robertson Smith*, London, 1912, p. 88.

"On the Flow of Electricity in Conducting Surfaces," was, in the opinion of Professor Hobson, the Sadleirian professor of pure mathematics at Cambridge, a distinct contribution to the development of the subject and was consulted regularly by students for years afterwards.

The particular circumstance which directed the career of Robertson Smith in the direction of Semitic studies was the death, in the autumn of 1869, of Professor Sachs, professor of Hebrew at the Free Church College of Aberdeen. A. B. Davidson, his teacher at Edinburgh, urged him to apply for the position and then pushed his candidature. As a result, Smith was elected to the chair of Hebrew at Aberdeen on May 25, 1870. He was not yet twenty-four years old.

The papers and addresses of Robertson Smith before his election to the chair at Aberdeen were such that they could give little offense to the orthodox in the group of which he was a member. Yet, one can see in them the beginnings of the more liberal views of which he later became the spectacular champion. In an address to the Theological Society at the Free College, Edinburgh, in November, 1869, he was concerned with the question of authority of the confession as distinguished from the authority of the Scriptures.

> I do not think it can be questioned that the current theory of the necessity of confessions as the legal standard of theological orthodoxy does imply that as a statement of doctrine the symbols of our Church are better and more distinct than Scripture. And it seems equally plain that this can be reconciled with the paramount authority which, as Protestants, we must ascribe to the Bible only by admitting a difference of kind between the Bible and the confession. . . . But this is just the point which the orthodox theology of our days seems unable either to concede or to deny; and it is this half-heartedness that exposes us to the insinuations of those without that we really set our orthodox theology above the Bible.[2]

In this rather involved statement he is maintaining that the purpose of Scripture is not the communication of doctrine. Furthermore, theology is something more than mere deduction from Scripture; it rests upon other data, the inner consciousness of those who have experienced the fellowship with God. To put it into his words, theology is "a positive activity of the theologising subject dialectically evolving the contents of an internal consciousness." There is little here to offend one who has enough theological training to understand what he means.

In January, 1869, Smith wrote on the risky subject of "Christianity and the Supernatural." In this essay he touches upon the question of the authority of the Bible and asserts that for him the authority of Christ is primary, while the authority of the Scripture is derived from that. He sees that there are dangers in an exaltation of the Bible.

[2] *Lectures and Essays of William Robertson Smith,* edited by J. S. Black and G. Chrystal, London, 1912, p. 145.

> Were communion with the Bible to fill for us the place of communion with Christ, we should treat the Bible with superstition and be guilty of sin against Christ who is Lord and Master of the Scripture, and not less against Scripture which seeks only to be His minister to lead us up to Christ and to keep us close to Him.[3]

This could hardly be called unsound doctrine.

In April, 1870, an article, "On the Question of Prophecy in the Critical Schools of the Continent," appeared. In it he defines higher criticism and asserts that it is based on the conception of the organic unity of all history. Any tradition which violates the continuity of historical development and stands in no relation to that which has gone before and that which comes after must be untrue. According to this view the prophet "presents himself to the critical inquirer, less in the light of one who is the passive subject of supernatural influence, than as a man whose life and thoughts are determined by personal fellowship with Jahveh and by intelligent insight into his purpose."[4] At least, Smith was now aware of the point of view which he was later to espouse.

The inagural address at Aberdeen was called "What History Teaches Us to Seek in the Bible," a learned lecture which sets forth the difference between pre-Reformation and Reformation exegesis. Reformation exegesis, he maintains, is akin to higher criticism.

> The higher criticism does not mean negative criticism. It means the fair and honest looking at the Bible as a historical record, and the effort everywhere to reach the real meaning and historical setting, not of individual *passages* of the Scripture, but of the Scripture Records as a whole; and to do this we must apply the same principle that the Reformation applied to detail Exegesis. We must let the Bible speak for itself. Our notions of the origin, the purpose, the character of the Scripture books must be drawn, not from vain traditions, but from a historical study of the books themselves. This process can be dangerous to faith only when it is begun without faith—when we forget that the Bible history is no profane history, but the story of God's saving self-manifestation.[5]

During the early years of his professorship, Robertson Smith was careful to dissociate himself from the more extreme of the higher critics. In July, 1871, he wrote of the Leiden school of theology and complained that these men of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* refused to see a difference in kind between Christianity and the other religions of the world. Yet, he was anxious to know more of the criticism of the Continent. The second summer of his professorship he spent at Göttingen working with Lagarde in Arabic poetry. The following summer he again paid a visit to Germany. On each of these visits Smith was careful to renew old contacts and to make new ones with the leading critics and theologians in Germany. These friendships were later a source of comfort during the years of his trial.

Professor Smith had been teaching six years in the Free Church

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 136. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 186. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

College at Aberdeen when the question was first raised with regard to the orthodoxy of his views. Had he alligned himself during those six years with the extreme critics, such as Kuenen in Leiden? Indeed he had not. To be sure, he had been fair enough to present to his classes these views and charitable enough to grant that these extreme critics might even have a personal faith, "which often is nourished from very different sources and lives in spite of a blighting philosophy." As a sample of the fair way in which he presented the views of Kuenen and the modern school the following paragraph from a lecture dated June, 1876, is of interest:

> The old theology treated of God, His attributes, His manifestation, His dealings with men. The new school treats of religion. Its theology is a discussion of man's beliefs about God, of man's religious actions and feelings. When these have been analysed, and when their development has been traced, the modern theologian is perfectly happy. Religion has been genetically explained from its beginnings down to the present time. Its ideas are most valuable, for they are part of the organic development of human thought. They are the inalienable property of the human race, just like the Pyramids or any other great work of men's hands. . . . If we have got the highest religious convictions current in our time, we are, as it were, at the crest of the wave, and that is the highest thing possible to us. The prophets occupy this position.[8]

The refutation by Smith of these dangerous views is the assertion that the men who have stirred the consciousness of history are men who believed themselves the very spokesmen of God. They believed that the spirit which inspired them was not some immanent spirit but something very different from themselves. Christianity is due to those who believed in a truly supernatural work. Certainly this is not a radical or dangerous teaching.

The famous controversy, "the Robertson Smith case," centred about an article of fifteen pages which appeared toward the end of the year 1875 in the third volume of the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It was the article "Bible" written by Professor Smith. When one reads it today, he is impressed with the thoroughness with which the writer has presented the views which had long been current in the scholarly circles of the Continent. The emphasis is upon the diversity rather than upon the traditional view of the unity of the books of the Bible. Such ideas as the gradual development of the religion of revelation, progress in spiritual religion through struggle, the stratification of biblical history, expression of regret over the misconception of prophecy as prediction—all these familiar concepts appear. With regard to Deuteronomy he is careful to point out that it is not a pious fraud. He says: "Beyond doubt the book is, as already hinted, a prophetic legislative programme;

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 363 f.

and if the author put his work in the mouth of Moses instead of giving it, with Ezekiel, a directly prophetic form, he did so not in pious fraud, but simply because his object was not to give a new law, but to expound and develop Mosaic principles in relation to new needs."

The beginning of the controversy may be said to have been the publication of an article in the Edinburgh *Courant* of April 16, 1876, "The New *Encyclopædia Britannica* on Theology." The article is believed to have been written by Dr. A. H. Charteris, professor of biblical criticism at the University of Edinburgh. His criticism was resented particularly by the clergy of the Free Church in that it came from a member of the Church of Scotland, a rival group which was not particularly noted for its evangelical orthodoxy. The article accused Robertson Smith of reproducing the theories of Kuenen. The lines of the argument set forth in this article were the lines which the case followed over a period of five years.

> . . . This article which we are discussing is objectionable in itself; but our chief objection to it is that it should be sent far and wide over English-speaking countries as an impartial account of the present state of our knowledge of the Bible. We regret that a publication which will be admitted without suspicion into many a religious household, and many a carefully guarded public library, should, upon so all-important a matter as the records of our faith, take a stand—a decided stand—on the wrong side. We hope the publisher and the editor will look after the contributors—or after each other—and cease to pass off rationalistic speculations as ascertained facts.[7]

A month later Smith's article was brought to the official notice of the College Committee of the Church, and the case had begun. Before another month had passed a pamphlet had appeared with the ominous title, *Infidelity in the Aberdeen Free Church College.* When one considers the heat of the controversy, even in its initial period, it is surprising that Professor Smith was allowed to teach during the following year. Yet, he was not suspended from teaching until May 29, 1877, by a motion in the General Assembly of the Free Church.

It became necessary, of course, for the opposition to formulate a definite statement of libel with regard to the views of Professor Smith. This is a long and tiresome document consisting of eight definite charges documented from the writings of the heretical professor. An abbreviated summary of these charges gives a picture of the general attitude of the Free Church toward matters of biblical criticism. To the following points in Smith's writings the libel objected:

Primo: The laws of the Levitical system were not instituted until long after the death of Moses.

Secundo: Deuteronomy is not a historical document as it claims, but is made to assume it by a writer of a much later date.

[7] *The Life,* p. 189.

Tertio: Biblical authors made use of the same devices as other authors, put fictitious speeches into the mouths of historical characters, wrote under the influence of party spirit.

Quarto: Some books of the Bible are of a fictitious character.

Quinto: Canticles is devoid of any spiritual significance in that it only presents a high example of virtue in a betrothed maiden.

Sexto: Titles for Old Testament books cited in the New Testament cannot be used as evidence for authorship of these books.

Septimo: Predictions of the prophets were due to spiritual insight and not to direct supernatural revelation of events long posterior to the prophet's own age.

Octavo: The reality of angels is in the Bible a matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching.

The libel was careful to place three general charges against Professor Smith: First, he contradicted the doctrine of inspiration; secondly, he published opinions which had an "unsettling tendency" on the doctrine of immediate inspiration; thirdly, by their "neutrality of attitude" they tended to disparage divine authority.

When this well-documented libel was passed to Smith on February 12, 1878, he proceeded to write an answer, which was published in a pamphlet of sixty-four pages. During the remainder of that year the case was discussed at length in three bodies of the Free Church, the Presbytery, the Free Synod of Aberdeen, and the General Assembly. The case dragged on through the year 1879; it was not until the General Assembly of 1880 that a final vote was taken on the libel. On the morning of May 27th of that year there were applicants for admission to the ladies' gallery as early as half-past six; long before the opening at ten o'clock every available seat was taken. Students in the gallery engaged in cheering and hissing as the various principals of the case entered the floor of the House. When the final vote came, after eleven o'clock in the evening, it was found by the Assembly that there was not sufficient ground for the charge of heresy, but that Professor Smith should be admonished by the moderator for his unguarded and incomplete statements. The admonition was given, and Robertson Smith accepted it gracefully. Thus, it seemed, had the case come to an end after four weary years of bitter controversy.

Following the vindication of Smith by the General Assembly of 1880, he was showered with messages of congratulations from his colleagues at home and abroad. Wellhausen wrote from Leiden, where he was visiting; Ritschl sent congratulations; Kuenen wrote; Lagarde wrote to say "... you behaved most wonderfully ...." Nöldeke commented philosophically, "After all, the world will not stand still, however pleasant a state of repose might be to many!" Professor T. S. Baynes, editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* thanked God on behalf of the church, but ex-

pressed disappointment that the verdict had thwarted his plan of attaching Smith to the staff of the *Britannica.* Dr. Aldis Wright, secretary of the Old Testament Revision Committee, of which Smith was a member, testified to his faith in the cause: "I have all along trusted that the cause of free investigation would win, as it always has done, in the struggle with theological dogmatism." Others saw in the admonition to which Smith had been forced to submit a shadow upon the victory. T. K. Cheyne wrote: "I was most pleased, but my joy was dashed by the humiliation which you have had to suffer." Sir William Huggins went so far as to say: "I cannot help looking upon you still as a giant in fetters, or like Lazarus with the grave-clothes upon him."[8]

Sir William's apprehension was soon found to be justified. In less than a month another attack had been launched against Smith, based this time upon an article in the eleventh volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* "Hebrew Language and Literature." The Commission, upon petition from twelve presbyteries, met to consider the new charges and, after a spirited debate on October 27, 1880, again suspended Professor Smith from his chair at Aberdeen. On that occasion Smith made a memorable speech lasting an hour and three-quarters. It is of interest to observe the impression it made upon one who had no sympathy for the views which it set forth. In an anonymous pamphlet, now known to have been written by the Reverend Dr. Kennedy, of Dingwall, there appears this picture:

> . . . There is a great deal in him, but it was put into him, and oh, hasn't he the power to put it forth! . . . But he doesn't grow his own wool, nor does he spin the thread, nor weave the webs that are in his cellar or on his shelves. All his goods come in paper parcels from Germany, for in that country they can spin and weave without one tuft of wool; they take their thread, like a spider, out of their own bowels. His friends are fond of saying that he has mastered the German learning. But I am thinking rather that the German learning has mastered him. . . . But oh! that tongue of his can rattle quick. And he can stick to his point as well as a limpet to a stone, or rather as the wheels to the rails, for he will be going till you would think that he would never halt. . . . A tiny little hand at his side is working like the docked tail of a pony when the midges are bad, but that is all the help the other parts of his body give to his tongue. It gets almost all the work to do, and all it needs to keep it going is a little calfsfoot oil from the heels that are thumping in the gallery. And he is as empty of reverence and as smart as a weasel; and he has as little common sense as a sucking calf. His gifts are cleverness and memory. And it's for this same that they made an idol of him. Well! well! if that's all they have to make them proud of him, they will get a thousand times more of that in the Evil One himself. Oh, but it's a sad pass we have come to, when a little of what the Devil has much of will make a man great in the Church.[9]

There were, however, other reactions to this speech. Richard Burton,

[8] For quotations from these letters see *ibid.,* pp. 364-368.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 401.

in characteristic language, wrote: "... But what the Devil (a Ruskinism, there is no such body) will the Assembly say after the merry jig you have executed upon their pet corns?"[10] An old friend, Sheriff Nicolson, one of the members of the Evening Club in Edinburgh, wrote encouragingly:

> . . . Go you ahead, therefore, my dear boy, and stick to your guns, and believe that you are doing right, and that if (as we believe) God is with you, and not with these bloated obscurantists—some of them good, well-meaning souls, but the strongest and worst of them simply priests and nothing more—Free Churchmen and yet priests, believers or pretending believers in infallibility, and in purely official religion—divorced equally from morality and reality. . . .[11]

Smith had the encouragement not only of his intimate friends and scholarly colleagues, but he had gained a large popular following in Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. On November 22, 1880, a mass meeting attended by two thousand persons was held on his behalf in Aberdeen. In the previous year his fellow citizens had, as a gesture of public sympathy, elected him as a member of the Aberdeen school board. The publicity which had attended the case had created one of the largest popular markets on record for the wares of higher criticism. Public curiosity over these heretical views reached such a point that some six hundred Free Churchmen in Edinburgh and Glasgow invited Smith to deliver a series of popular lectures on the subject during January, February, and March of 1881 in these two cities. Smith accepted the invitation and delivered the lectures, published that same year as *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* to audiences in which the average attendance in the two cities was not less than eighteen hundred persons.

Following the publication of this series of popular lectures, the Edinburgh *Courant,* the same paper which five years before had published the review which started the controversy, published another review which contained this observation: "We cannot doubt that this stir and controversy over the Old Testament Scriptures will make the Old Testament far more than it has been amongst us, a living book. . . ."[12]

Finally the case came to an end, at least as far as the Free Church was concerned, when, on May 26, 1881, the General Assembly charged that Professor Smith had shown an "insensibility to his responsibilities as a theological professor," and a motion was passed by the Assembly stating that his occupancy of his chair was no longer safe nor advantageous for the church.

When one reads now the account of the extended debate—a digest of which occupies almost three hundred pages in the official *Life*—which

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 406.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 406.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 423.

took place in the church courts over a period of five years, one cannot but feel that it was the Free Church, and not Robertson Smith, which was tried and judged. The rapid advances of biblical criticism could not have been easily assimilated by the Free Church in Scotland. Its evangelical forms were not able to contain the ideas which Smith imported from the Continent. It is indeed a great irony that a church which had made such sacrifices for freedom from secular interference in 1843 could not, in 1881, bring itself to allow to its theological professors freedom of research. A contemporary critic well summed up the situation with the remark: "It is, therefore, evident that the alarm of the Scotch divines was due, not to the temerity of the late Professor, but solely to their own ignorance." Up to this point Robertson Smith had offered little which was original to the growing science of biblical criticism; his contribution had been that of a mediator of the views which he had learned from his European colleagues. His success in becoming the spearhead of this invasion of the British Isles by higher criticism was due to the stubborn resistance which his own church offered to the invasion and to the temporary sacrifice which Smith was called upon to make. True it is that there had been a Colenso, but Colenso had dealt with the more superficial aspects of the problems; he had lacked the specialized training which was necessary for a thorough grasp of the details of the problems involved.

An article published in the *Britannica* had been the occasion for Smith's trial, which resulted in the loss of his source of income; at the close of the trial it was the editor of the *Britannica* who engaged him in the capacity of joint editor of this important undertaking. In the first eleven volumes Smith's contributions did not exceed twenty articles; in the remaining thirteen volumes, published after his official connection with the encyclopædia, he was responsible for more than two hundred articles. Because of his wide acquaintance with European scholars in the biblical field, he was able to secure their help to make this edition of the *Britannica* representative of the best biblical scholarship. He secured biblical articles from such notable scholars as Wellhausen, Nöldeke, Hatch, Schürer, and Harnack. Eventually, Smith became the editor-in-chief of the *Britannica* and carried this heavy burden without sacrificing his own original researches.

Sometime before the final decision of the General Assembly, President Eliot, of Harvard, invited Smith to come there as professor of Hebrew and oriental languages. He was, at the time, unwilling to leave the controversy until there was a definite decision from the Assembly. Later, President Eliot wrote announcing that, in default of Smith, Harvard had secured the services of an American heretic, whose views on Isaiah had offended the Baptist communion of which he was a member. This was

Professor Crawford H. Toy, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Mention has already been made of the first book of Robertson Smith, the lectures which he delivered to popular audiences during the winter of 1881, entitled *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.* Written as it was during the bitterest part of the controversy, one might expect it to be something other than what it is, a fair and honest attempt to interpret the results of criticism to the layman. The author is patient with the pains involved in making the adjustment to new views, and points out that only indifferent people can readily make adjustments. He is anxious to teach those who want to know of the newer methods and with those who wish to learn he exercises great patience. But toward those who do not want to be enlightened he is not so charitable:

> I leave it to the consciences of those dignitaries and leaders of the English and Scottish churches who have refused and still refuse to study the modern criticism, to determine whether their lofty indifference to matters that have been to every diligent student of the Scriptures the cause of great searchings of heart, is indeed a fruit of surer faith and truer insight than is given to those who bear the burden and heat of the day in the field of Biblical study. . . .[13]

Eleven years later Smith revised this work and added to it about one-third more material.

Smith's second book, *The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History to the Close of the Eighth Century B. C.,* was a collection of popular lectures delivered to Sunday evening audiences in Edinburgh and Glasgow during the winter of 1882. While this is not an original contribution to the interpretation of prophetic literature, it is happily adorned with occasional flashes of insight into the meaning of historical situations. Throughout it makes use of sound principles of interpretation and it is yet important, as a later editor of the work has said, "not so much as giving established facts, but as enabling us to see the classical prophetic age as it appeared to an eminent student and teacher in a somewhat earlier phase of study."

As early as 1872 Smith had studied Arabic poetry with Paul de Lagarde at Göttingen. In 1875 he continued his Arabic studies and went so far as to arrange a small class in the subject for his more advanced students. During the winter of 1878-1879, when there was a lull in the ecclesiastical trial, Smith spent his enforced leave from his teaching studying Arabic in Cairo. Here he progressed rapidly; that winter his proficiency was such that he was able to act as a dragoman. The following winter he spent in the Middle East and made a journey across Arabia from Jeddah to Tâif. This interesting journey Smith described in a series of eleven letters published in the *Scotsman.* This correspondence is packed

[13] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* second edition, New York, 1892, p. 128.

with details of customs, manners, the personalities of his companions and hosts, and is, by all odds, written in the most interesting style of any of his writings. The last letter exhibits an interest in the social problem of the slave trade which was carried on upon the Red Sea, an evil to which the consular officials were indifferent. That Smith had little respect for the religion of Islam is evident from one of these letters:

> Speaking broadly, I have no hesitation in saying that the religion of the Hejâz is now, and probably has been from the days of Mohammed, no better than an organised hypocrisy. . . . But the more one sees of it, the less it is possible to feel any sincere respect for Moslem devotion, in which formalism and vain repetition are reduced to a system.[14]

The first scientific contribution in the field of Arabic studies appeared in the *Journal of Philology*, June, 1880, in the form of an article entitled "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament." In this he attempted to apply the totem theory of his friend J. F. M'Lennan to both the Arabs and the Hebrews. The article was later expanded and used in one of his most important books. In this article Smith had not yet ceased to be a theologian and notes at the conclusion of his evidence for the Hebrews that "it does not appear that Israel was, by its own wisdom, more fit than any other nation to rise above the lowest level of heathenism."

We have seen that the death of Professor Sachs at Aberdeen in 1869 was the occasion for Smith's leaving the field of physics for that of biblical criticism; thirteen years later it was the death of Professor Palmer, Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic at Cambridge, which produced a vacancy into which Smith entered, this time leaving the field of biblical criticism for that of Arabic, the field of study in which he made his most lasting scientific contribution. On January 1, 1883, he was appointed Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic and later that year moved to Cambridge, where he spent the remainder of his life. While at Cambridge he held two other important posts. Since the appointment as Lord Almoner's Reader carried with it neither heavy responsibilities nor a large salary, Smith felt justified in allowing his name to be entered as a candidate for the post of librarian of the University, when that became vacant in 1886. In February of 1886 he was elected librarian, in which capacity he served for three years. Upon the death of Professor William Wright in May of 1889, Smith was elected to succeed him in the Sir Thomas Adams chair of Arabic at Cambridge. This, Robertson Smith occupied until his death on March 31, 1894.

We turn now to a consideration of the two books in which Smith made the contribution upon which his fame rests. Robertson Smith was

[14] *Lectures and Essays*, pp. 492 f., 511.

among the first British scholars who saw that the basic problems of Old Testament criticism could be solved only on the basis of an understanding of the thought and culture of the Semites in general. Theories with regard to social organization of groups in the Old Testament had to be tested and tried by available evidence from other Semitic groups. Smith saw in the literature of the pre-Islamic Arabs a means of getting at the problem of social organization among the Semites. Further, he was stimulated by the growing science of the investigation of primitive religion and primitive society through his distinguished friend, J. F. M'Lennan. In his work, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia,* Robertson Smith took the hypothesis of M'Lennan, which the latter had established through his study of ethnology, and sought to subject it to the evidence available from early Arabic literature. The result of this new combination may be summed up in a sentence:

> The general result of this argument then is that kinship through the mother alone was originally the universal rule of Arabia, and that kinship through males sprang up in polyandrous groups of kinsmen which brought in wives from outside but desired to keep the children of these alien women to themselves.[15]

This general hypothesis he sought to apply to the material of the Old Testament in order to throw light upon some of the difficulties there. The conclusion to which Smith arrived, which has been called the theory of "mother-right" as the rule of primitive Semitic culture, has been supported by the opinions of Nöldeke, Wellhausen, and more recently by J. Morgenstern.[16] It must be admitted, that the theory of primitive mother-right has been strongly contested, particularly by more recent ethnologists, as B. Z. Seligman and Westermarck; yet, this in no way detracts from the credit of Smith, whose researches were destined to inagurate a new era in the study of Semitic religion. He saw the dangers inherent in the practice of isolationism in biblical study and sought to remedy this glaring defect by branching out into what was then the most fruitful field of research for a knowledge of primitive Semitic religion and life. It must be borne in mind that in Smith's day Assyriology was not yet on a sound enough basis to afford reliable evidence for the study of Semitic religion; the foundation stones for our knowledge of Canaanite religion had not yet been discovered; Sumerian mythology was not even dreamed of in his day. Without question pre-Islamic Arabia offered the most valuable field for study in the day in which Smith worked. So thoroughly did he deal with these sources that his labors have endured. *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* appeared first in 1885, in which year the material had been pre-

[15] *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia,* Cambridge, 1885, p. 151.
[16] See D. Jacobson, *The Social Background of the Old Testament,* 1942, chap. 1, for the more recent bibliography on this question.

sented as the Easter term lectures of the Lord Almoner's professor; a second and revised edition was published in 1903, containing additional notes from the margin of the author's copy and by Professor Ignaz Goldziher, of Budapest. It was edited by Stanley A. Cook.

In 1887 the Burnett Trustees of the University of Aberdeen invited Smith to give a series of lectures on Semitic religion. The first series of nine lectures was delivered in the Hall of Marischal College, Aberdeen, in October of 1888 and in March of 1889. Two additional lectures were added later, and the whole was published in November of 1889 under the title, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites.* The second and third series of the Burnett lectures were delivered but never published.

It is this last book and most famous work which entitles Smith to an important place among the founders of the comparative study of religion, or as one learned admirer has termed him, as the founder of the "science and theory of religion." His work in this new field, it must be frankly admitted, has not always stood up under the fire of subsequent criticism and research, but it cannot be denied that it proved to be one of the major stimuli to the study of the phenomena of religion in its ritualistic and institutional aspects. In this learned analysis of certain fundamental institutions of Semitic religion the emphasis is placed upon a knowledge of practice in religion as a key to an understanding of its essential character. Underlying the common practice of religious groups is a belief in communion between the worshiper and his god. This communion, of which sacrifice is a symbol or token in Semitic religion, is the most vital of all religious phenomena. Stanley A. Cook has taken the pains to discover that this essential insight into the true character of Semitic religion appears in germ in the earlier theological writings from a period when Smith's concern was more directly with the theology of the Christian tradition. As early as 1875, in an essay on "The Place of Theology in the Work and Growth of the Church," Smith had defined the function of theology in terms of making explicit and of elaborating the truths which "in the shape of practical tact and insight lie at the root of untheological wisdom." So, if modern theology should seek to communicate the fruits of practical religious experience based upon communion, then a valid interpretation of the meaning of ancient myth or primitive theology was to be found in the practice which lay beneath the mythological description of reality. In the description of his method of inquiry into Semitic religion, Robertson Smith is careful to distinguish between the actual religion of the people, to be seen in the rites which they employ, and the explanations of these rites in myths, which he calls the ancient equivalents of dogma. "The conclusion is," he states, "that in the study of ancient religions we must begin, not with myth, but with ritual and traditional usage." Here

we see a thread of continuity running through the work of Smith from the early days of his professorship in Aberdeen, where he sought to take an active part in the Christian movement by training ministers, to the latter days when his contribution to religion lay in the realm of theory and interpretation of an ancient faith. In both situations he utilized his keen insight into the true nature of religion, be it ancient or modern. The material in *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* is too widely known to require even the most cursory summary. To be sure, much of the material has been superceded—Robertson Smith would certainly be the first to admit the need for revision; but this volume has, in its four editions, been a strong stimulus to the critical study of many problems connected with the scientific study of religions. To mention only a few evidences of this influence, there are the works of Sir James Frazer, Principal F. B. Jevons, Salomon Reinach, and B. Stade.

Robertson Smith was declared a heretic by his church; his theory with regard to the institution of sacrifice was such that one critic argued that his theories "cut away the basis on which the whole doctrine of salvation rests." Yet to the end Smith maintained that there was an essential difference between the religion of revelation in the Bible and the religions of heathenism. At the very end of his lectures at Marischal College, Aberdeen, he put his belief thus:

> The burden of explaining this contrast does not lie with me. It falls on those who are compelled by a false Philosophy of Revelation to see in the Old Testament nothing more than the highest point of the general tendencies of Semitic religion. This is not the view which that study commends to me. It is a view that is not commended, but condemned by the many parallelisms in detail between Hebrew and heathen story and ritual; for all these material points of resemblance only make the contrast in spirit the more remarkable.[17]

In his short life of forty-eight years Robertson Smith had a varied career; he had been a promising young theologian; he had made a brilliant beginning to a career in the exact sciences; his biblical criticism had been abruptly interrupted by the very men whom he sought to teach; he had, with credit, filled one of the important university chairs of Arabic; and in no small measure is the movement known as the comparative study of religion due to his brilliant syntheses. Yet, throughout his somewhat checkered career he had remained true to himself, a man of generous impulse and kindly spirit, who refused to become embittered by the controversy which raged about him. He was, to the very end, a man of deep religious faith, and, as has already been suggested, he remained a believer in the special inspiration of the Scriptures to the last.

[17] *The Life*, pp. 536 f.

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

It has often been said, and not unjustly, that it is possible to prove any contention by a quotation from the Bible. It is probably a rare preacher who has not quoted with enthusiasm, at one time or another, as the divine decree for peace and world brotherhood Isaiah's idyllic word: "And he will judge between the nations, and will decide concerning many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isa. 2:4). But another prophet was equally sure that he was proclaiming the word of Jehovah when he set forth the precisely opposite ideal, and in language strangely similar: "Proclaim ye this among the nations: prepare war; stir up the mighty men; let all the men of war draw near, let them come up. Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong" (Joel 3:10).

A not dissimilar situation is to be found in the gospels. According to Mark, Jesus' word was: "For he that is not against us is for us" (9:40). Matthew has no time for such latitudinarianism. Influenced by such sentiments as those expressed in the Sermon on the Mount (especially 7:21-23), he apparently felt such tolerance quite unwarranted. And so for him the word is very different: "He that is not with me is against me" (12:30). Luke does not take sides but placidly preserves both sayings (9:50 and 11:23).

But not infrequently two interpreters will quote the same verse to support mutually opposite, even contradictory, points of view. Thus two eminent rabbis of the second century are said to have had a heated discussion over the meaning of Lev. 25:36—"that thy brother may live with thee"—as applied to two men thirsting in the desert and with water sufficient for only one. Said the one: "They are to share the limited supply, for the Scripture says, 'that *thy brother may live* with thee.'" "No," said the other, "there would not be enough for both; the man is to keep the limited supply for himself, for the Scripture directs that the man himself is to live: 'that thy brother may live *with thee*.'"

Nor is this to be dismissed as "rabbinic" (non-Christian) casuistry. Precisely the same difference of interpretation is to be found in Paul and the author of Hebrews. Says Paul: "Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give peace unto the wrath [of God], for it is written, 'Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense,' saith the Lord" (Rom. 12:19). His meaning is clear. "Don't you avenge; leave it for God. You render good for evil." But for the author of Hebrews, although the quotation is identical, it proves a totally different contention. Not for him is it a warning against self-vengeance; instead it is an ominous warning to those who would

backslide from the Christian faith: God will surely and inevitably punish apostasy: it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God (Hebr. 12:30 f.)—a word that was later to prove such powerful ammunition for Jonathan Edwards.

Each of these authors found the quotation convenient and used it to buttress his argument. Not only do their two interpretations vary, each from the other, but both are equally at variance with the earlier word they so confidently cite. The verse in question is Deut. 32:35, in the famous "Song of Moses." Through God's good providence Israel has been brought from the wilderness and established in a fair and pleasant land. Far from being grateful, like a spoiled child Israel has turned away from her benefactor and fallen into idolatry. In consequence God has punished her sorely with one catastrophe after another, bringing her to the very verge of extinction at the hand of hostile peoples. But it is not the nations who have done it, though in their arrogant blindness they so assume. It is the living God, punishing Israel for her sins. But now that the time of punishment is over, now that it is the corruption and wickedness of her enemies which cry out for punishment, God will intervene for his now chastened people, will destroy their arrogant and wicked opponents.

Thus both Paul and his later fellow Christian are equally far from the clear intent of the cited proof text. It is not a warning against taking vengeance into one's own hands: the prostrate nation is in no condition to think of that suicidal attempt. Rather it is assurance to Israel that there is a source from which vengeance will be forthcoming. On the other hand, it is not a warning to God's people on the verge of apostasy; instead it is to those who have presumed to feel that they, not God, have brought Israel to her knees. Having cited this word, the author of Hebrews can continue his quotation: "The Lord shall judge his people." For him the word plainly means "will condemn them." But though these words follow in the word of Deuteronomy, their meaning there is quite the reverse; for the earlier author they mean "will vindicate."

Once again a pertinent and insistent question comes to the fore. What is the responsibility of the man who would quote Scripture to buttress his argument? Is it to try to let the words say what the original author intended, or is it, as an increasingly noisy group of would-be interpreters insists, that the real meaning of Scripture lies in what it is subsequently discovered to contain, that is, that the writers wrote more wisely than they knew so that only in the light of later specifically Christian insights the true meaning intended by God—and tucked in, so to speak, without the author being aware of it—comes to light and understanding? At the present moment, biblical interpretation again stands at the parting of the ways, much as did Abraham and Lot when, as the story goes, the former remained in Canaan while the latter pitched his tents toward Sodom. It is indeed curious how history does repeat itself.

From Off the Campus and On

One of the most difficult tasks in editing the Crozer Quarterly is preparing copy for this column. The pleasant and at times intimate relations that exist between author and editor by the time an article or review appears always seem to call for more than a mere identification. On the other hand, lack of space demands brevity and makes nearly inevitable such threadbare clichés as "Dr. So-and-So is too well known to readers of the Crozer Quarterly to need formal introduction" or "It is a pleasure to introduce Professor This-and-That." And when the same man is to be introduced in issue after issue, the chances of novelty are indeed slim. With a total lack of originality but with entire sincerity the editor can repeat all of these tried-and-true opening sentences for Professor Keighton. He *is* "too well known to our readers" to require formal introduction. Rarely an issue has appeared in years without one or more discerning reviews from him—always submitted well in advance of any deadline—and several in recent years have carried articles as well. His article this quarter was delivered as the matriculation address at Crozer at the opening of the present academic year. Readers will agree with those who heard it when delivered that it raises several important problems. Following twenty years as pastor of the Church of the Evangel, in Narberth, Pennsylvania, Professor Keighton came to Crozer as professor of preaching and worship. He is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania (A.B.) and of Crozer (B.D. and Th. M.). He is chairman of the committee of worship at Crozer and as such is responsible for the conduct of the services of public worship in which he has demonstrated some of the ideas herein expressed.

The editor confesses to more than usual pleasure in being able to print the posthumous article by his former preceptor and revered friend, James Hardy Ropes, for many years Hollis professor of divinity at Harvard and one of the sanest and most learned New Testament critics of his generation. It is hard to believe that the address was framed more than thirty years ago. Some theological writings are outmoded before they smell printer's ink; this is not one of them. Our deep appreciation is due to Professor Cadbury, also a former student of Professor Ropes and for many years his distinguished successor at Harvard, for editing and making available the notes of his former friend.

Bishop Hart raises an embarrassing question in his brief but pointed essay. He succeeded Bishop Taitt as head of the Episcopal diocese of Philadelphia in 1943, coming to Philadelphia from Trinity Church, Boston. He is a graduate of Hobart College, General Theological Seminary, and Union (New York) and holds several honorary doctorates. He was a chaplain with the A.E.F. during the first world war and also served as chaplain in World War II.

Professor Marcus joined the faculty of the University of Chicago as

assistant professor of hellenistic culture in 1943, following many years teaching Semitic philology at the Jewish Institute of Religion and Columbia. He received his Ph.D. from Columbia in 1927. His scholarly publications have been many, including several volumes in the Loeb Classical Library (Philo and Josephus). He is a member of the editorial boards of *Classical Philology* and the *Review of Religion.*

Professor Sevenster was born in Friesland, in the north of the Netherlands, where his father was a local minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. He studied at Leyden, Jena, Marburg, and Harvard, receiving the degree of master of theology from Harvard and a doctorate from Leyden. Following several years in the parish ministry, he became professor of New Testament exegesis at the University of Amsterdam in 1946.

Professor Pritchard, a graduate of Asbury, Drew, and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D.), has the chair of Old Testament at Crozer. For several years he was treasurer of the Society of Biblical Literature, resigning recently because of the pressure of duties incident to editing and preparing for publication a volume of ancient texts illustrating the Old Testament. Readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY will remember his several articles which have appeared in these pages from time to time.

Once again we can but call the roll of our reviewers. Dr. Albright, an eminent orientalist, is professor of Semitic languages at Johns Hopkins. Dr. Aubrey is president of Crozer and professor of theology. Dr. Baldwin is the minister of the Chestnut Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia. Dr. Bixler is president of Colby. Professor Brightman is on the faculty of philosophy at Boston University. Mr. Clayton is an executive with the Pullman Company. Dr. Clinchy is president of the National Council of Christians and Jews. Dr. Davis is a professor of theology at Crozer. Dr. Franklin is president *emeritus* of Crozer and a lifelong student of missions. Dr. Grant is a professor of New Testament at Union and editor of the *Anglican Theological Review.* Professor Harkness is head of the department of church history at Crozer. Dr. Herrick is president *emeritus* of Andover Newton. Dr. Horton is professor of theology at Oberlin. Dr. Igler has been for over twenty years Baptist student pastor at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Ivey is minister of the Second Baptist Church, Richmond, Va. Dr. Knudson is dean *emeritus* of the Boston University School of Theology. Professor McCasland has the chair of religion at the University of Virginia. Professor Montgomery is the distinguished professor *emeritus* of Semitics of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Morrison has the chair of homiletics at Colgate-Rochester. Dr. Rose is minister of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia. Dr. Young is an instructor of biblical literature at Duke.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Origins of Christian Supernaturalism, by Shirley Jackson Case, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1946, pp. vii, 239. $3.

No American scholar has done more than Dean Case to make students of the New Testament and of early church history aware of the importance of the hellenistic background of primitive Christianity. His *Evolution of Early Christianity* (1914) has served generations of college and seminary students in this way; his *Social Triumph of the Early Church* (1933) and his *Jesus: a New Biography* (1927), to mention only two of his other works among many, all of them outstanding, have made every liberal student conscious of the significance of environment for Christian origins—whether or not the student went on to embrace the whole social-historical theory which Case's works unfold. His important *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times* (1929) has unfortunately been out of print for some years. The present volume recasts the data used in that volume, and presents its contents with added attention to their implications. For interest in the supernatural was not peculiar to early Christianity: the world was full of it, in the first and following centuries. What Christianity did was, first, accommodate itself to the situation and then, in order to prove its own superiority to other cults, outdo them in meeting what was an obvious religious need of the times. The Christian cultus, tradition, organization, doctrine, literature were all supported by a vast array of supernatural events, revelations, and interpretations. Philosophy might be permitted to help, as far as its aid was useful in supporting the supernatural institution and its claims; but the critical reason, or the scientific search for truth (*e.g.*, in the study of nature or the direct examination of human experience), was held within strict bounds. In all this, Christianity was only outdoing what other religious cults and movements of the time were attempting or claiming to do. Christianity succeeded where other religions failed, for the reason that it more successfully met the pagan where it found him, and satisfied his religious needs, which were very real and universally felt. Thus "Christian supernaturalism arose to serve a functional need in the course of the new religion's expansion within its particular environment and in relation to characteristic modes of thinking prevalent in that day" (pp. 233 f.). But human needs change with the changing years; and in the modern world the need for such a functional adaptation grows steadily less and less. It is the Christian way of life that is essential, whether with or without the outer scaffolding and support which supernaturalism once gave but which is now more an embarrassment than a help.

The reader's response to this thesis will be determined by his own presuppositions. Those for whom the supernatural is of the essence of Christian life will demur, and will point out that our religion did not merely adapt itself to a supernaturalistic environment in the first century—it was itself supernaturalist from the start. What could be more supernatural than the resurrection of Jesus, with which Christianity began? Others will agree wtih the author, and welcome the suggestion that faith may now do without the "decorative garment in which it was clothed to please the eye of a miracle-loving age" (p. vi)—in fact, in a scientific age like ours, this is no longer a privilege but a necessity. That the view is not limited to such radical or independent minds as Dr. Case's may be seen by comparing it with that of the late Baron von Hügel, who insisted that the true supernatural is the life in grace of the saints, far superior to its external manifestation in unaccountable events (see his *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion,* 1921).

But apart from the thesis, which perhaps many more readers will welcome than will say so, the great value of this book for every student of the New Testament and of early church history is its detailed and documented survey of the whole field of hellenistic religious and philosophical culture, a survey which is interestingly written and helps to make vivid the firsthand implications of many a New Testament idea and turn of expression. My only suggestion is that the supernaturalistic element in primitive Christianity itself could have been more strongly presented, *i.e.*, in the very earliest period. The reader is sometimes left with the impression that the church was consciously adapting itself to its environment; whereas it was itself, from the start, part and parcel of that environment, so to speak—"a part of all that I have met." One other suggestion: a little more attention could be paid to Judaism, which at the popular level, as reflected both in the gospels and in the old Tannaite traditions, was thoroughly supernaturalist (*cf.* p. 3).

I have a few questions: Was it only *after* excommunication from the synagogue that Christians had to "tap new sources of revelation" (p. 15)? Was the earliest conception of Jesus' "apparitions" from the dead (p. 30) merely that here was proof of his survival, or was it that he was now Messiah?—as J. Weiss held. And is not the idea of his "ascension" (p. 34) a rather late one? Was the casting of lots "widely" practiced by Christians (p. 45)? The author properly stresses the importance of native hero cults in the development of emperor worship (p. 75), rather than mere imitation of oriental custom—a view shared by Festugière and others; and also the tremendous reality of these cults in the everyday religion of the hellenistic-Roman age. Some writers would leave us with the impression that the only vital religions in the hellenistic age were the foreign mystery cults! But the old gods still had their worshipers (*cf.* p. 102).

Was not Plato's objection to the private cults (pp. 98 f.) more than a conformist's dislike of free religious associations? There was something objectionable and even obnoxious to a Greek about most of them! Was Clea a Bacchanal (p. 80), or a priestess of Isis? Or does Plutarch mean (*de Isid.* 35, p. 364E) that she was a Delphic priestess who was *also* an initiate of *Osiris?* (On p. 14, read "cymbals"; and should not "sistra" be singular?) On p. 117, should it not be recognized that there were two kinds of pagan sacrifice, bloody and unbloody?—a distinction made from early times. Was not the idea of the beneficent function of the empire (pp. 128 ff.) to be found almost from the beginning of Christian propaganda, say in Paul? And is it quite true to say (with Gibbon and others) that it was the "best" emperors who persecuted the Christians most severely (p. 140)? Were Decius and Diocletian better men than the Antonines? Was it the failure of the foreign slave to find "satisfaction" in his master's cult that sent him looking elsewhere (p. 148), or was he simply not permitted to share it? Perhaps something could be done to free Hippocrates' name from the legend repeated on p. 154, *viz.*, that he took over the technique of Epidauros—see O. Kern's *Religion der Griechen,* III (1938), p. 153: the cult of Asclepius is later than Hippocrates. And were the "old stories," as Dibelius calls them, in the tradition of Jesus later than Paul (p. 155)? Might it not be well to note that the rude hilarity during the procession to Eleusis (p. 168) was limited to one day, and may have had another and simpler explanation than the one that pious old Plutarch gave? (Among other things, compare the behavior of some of the attendants at popular "Easter sunrise services" in the U.S.A.!) Was ancient education so dominantly philosophical as p. 198 suggests? What of the universal and all but suffocating dominance of rhetoric, as Wendland, Fowler, and others (including Case himself!) have pointed out?

These queries may seem captious and picayune; but they are worth making with reference to as important and I trust permanent a book as the one before us. A fly-by-night novelistic sketch, of the kind the publishers sometimes inflict upon us, would not be worth careful checking. But here is a book of first-rate importance, the distillation of a great scholar's lifelong research, and one that I trust will be read as long after these days as these days postdate his famous *Evolution of Early Christianity*.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

A History of American Philosophy, by Herbert W. Schneider, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946, pp. xiv, 646, $4.50.

Professor Schneider has given us the most scholarly and the most comprehensive history of American philosophy yet written. Up to the present, several surveys have been available. Woodbridge Riley's *American Thought* was too brief and sketchy in treatment and in bibliography, although helpful on the early period and on French influences. H. G. Townsend restricted himself largely to epistemological and metaphysical theories in his *Philosophical Ideas in the United States*, although greatly improving on Riley's bibliographies. The *Amerikanische Philosophie* of Gustav E. Mueller presented the greater movements and minds in broad and illuminating strokes. However, in great works like Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought* and Curti's *The Growth of American Thought* philosophy proper played a relatively minor rôle. There is valuable material in A. K. Rogers' *English and American Philosophy since 1800* and in the sections on American philosophy by Morris R. Cohen in the *Cambridge History of American Literature* and by G. C. Cell in Vol. V of Überweg's *Geschichte der Philosophie*. Many books and articles have been written on special periods and the source books by Anderson and Fisch and (especially) by Muelder and Sears are valuable. A new source book, Blau's *American Philosophical Addresses 1700 to 1900*, has been prepared to accompany Schneider.

Yet until Schneider, with all this work, we had no full-length history of American philosophy. We are fortunate in having the most competent man in the entire country to be the author of the book before us. Lifelong researches have been devoted to various aspects of American thought by Schneider, and his editorial work with the *Journal of Philosophy* kept the current picture before his mind. Outstanding among the merits of this work is the excellent "Guide to the Literature" which occurs at the end of each part, supplying an annotated chronological bibliography that is far superior to anything hitherto accessible.

When confronted with the mass of material which he had accumulated, Schneider had to decide first of all on what principle he would arrange his facts. He might have chosen a chronological arrangement by periods; he might have dwelt on geographical development, contrasting New England with the Atlantic States, the South, and the West. Again, he might have adopted the usual method of dealing with the thought of each outstanding man and the influences emanating from him. He might have put schools of philosophy in the foreground. Schneider chose none of these procedures, but instead he approached his problem from the standpoint of (roughly) successive phases of the intellectual climate. He is interested in the history of ideas more than in philosophies or men.

The book is divided into eight parts, as follows: Platonism and Empiricism in Colonial America, the American Enlightenment, Nationalism and Democracy, Orthodoxy, The Transcendental Temper, Evolution and Human Progress, Idealisms, and Radical Empiricism (under which pragmatism and naturalism are prominent). In the

headings of the forty-one chapters one finds the names of only two men, Emerson and Josiah Royce. It is interesting to compare this with Royce's own view that the history of American thought is summarized in the names of Jonathan Edwards, Emerson, and William James. The reader, then, should not expect to find a connected account of the systems of very many individual thinkers, although the admirable index will allow him to piece together the main facts about a Jonathan Edwards and his influence, a Walt Whitman, an Orestes Brownson, or almost anyone else.

Schneider is especially useful to those who are interested in the history of American religious thought and its relation to cultural, social, political, and (to a lesser extent) scientific ideas. In this respect, the rich detail of the book stands in sharp contrast to the severe limitations which Riley and Townsend placed upon themselves by the scope and method of their works. Unlike some historians, such as the Beards, Schneider knows that America cannot be understood without an understanding of American religion. He discusses the early pietist theory of love, the rise of liberal religion, the intellectual defense of orthodoxy (which he defines somewhat loosely), "spirituality among Christians," "desperate naturalism," and the relations of recent idealisms and empiricisms to religion. In these treatments he is eminently well informed, objective, and full in detail, giving a fair place to most currents of thought, except perhaps those of Judaism, Catholicism (Brownson being the only Catholic treated at length), and Christian Science. Joseph Smith, surely less philosophical than Mrs. Eddy, receives mention, however.

It would exceed the limits of this review to set forth all the merits of this history. Some of them must be mentioned, if in a rather helter-skelter manner. One is the yearlong planning of the investigations of doctoral candidates at Columbia, whose researches have provided much of the groundwork for the book. It is most gratifying to note Schneider's generous acknowledgment of his debt to his able students. When one reflects on the lack of such acknowledgment by many German scholars and on uncredited ghostwriting of some American books (happily not philosophical), by students or subordinates, Schneider's frank avowal of his sources is refreshing.

At the very start, Schneider traces Puritan thought to the Renaissance Platonist, Peter Ramus (1515-1586), whose influence is mentioned in few histories of American thought. He points out the influence of Locke and Hutcheson on Edwards. Samuel Johnson is an Arminian and a Tory (but we may add that Hume's Toryism does not root in Arminius. He points out the bourgeois thought of the intellectuals like Thomas Paine, with their individualistic religion and their individualistic freedom of trade (quite "the American way of life"). Aaron Burr is "the Presbyterian hypocrite." Alexander Hamilton is "radically antifederal." Bancroft is shown to be influenced by Kant and Schleiermacher. The part played by Hegelian ideas in the development of American thought is freely recognized. This is welcome in a time like the present when Hegel is the whipping boy of everyone who has not troubled to read him carefully. Schneider, however, does not discuss the charge by Haushalter that Mrs. Eddy drew many of her ideas and terms from an essay on Hegel written by Francis Leiber.

Among the numerous difficult points which Schneider makes clear is the real point of James' perplexing question: "Does 'Consciousness' Exist?" Schneider shows that, in *The Pluralistic Universe* (p. 221), James avows "the impossibility of understanding how 'your' experience and 'mine' . . . can at the same time be members of a world-experience." James was repudiating absolutistic pantheism, and G. C. Cell

therefore found James to be nearer to the personalism of Berkeley or Bowne than James himself admitted.

A personalist like the reviewer naturally asks how personalism is treated in the volume. The answer is that the Bowne school is treated briefly but fairly, although other types of personalism are skimped. In declaring that later personalists have minimized Bowne's cosmological arguments Schneider tells only a part truth, for every personalist is concerned with the philosophy of nature. It is correct that later personalists are more concerned with theory of value than was Bowne. Two minor points in the bibliography on personalism should be noted. In the works attributed to this reviewer, the most important systematic book is omitted, namely, *An Introduction to Philosophy*. Then, curiously, the biography of Alfred Henry Lloyd in the *Dictionary of American Biography* is credited to E. S. Brightman (p. 506), whereas it was written by another E. S. B., Ernest Sutherland Bates.

No book can cover all questions. As we have said, Schneider deals well with the influences of Peter Ramus and of Hegel on American thought. His allusions to Calvin and Arminius, however, are casual and meagre. He misses Governor Bradford's lively repudiation of Platonic communism. Where W. Riley is strongest, namely, in dealing with the play of French thought on American, Schneider is weakest. He mentions Comte, but ignores Cousin and Renouvier and barely names Bergson. In general, the international interests of American philosophy come short, such as American participation in international congresses of philosophy, concern with oriental thought from Emerson to the present, and the rising tide of relations with Latin-American philosophers. Again, there are important movements which receive scant mention, such as critical realism, neorealism, and recent developments in idealism, both in its absolutistic and in its panpsychistic types. Names, for example, like those of Hocking, Boodin, Brand Blanshard, Urban, Parker, Hartshorne, and even Whitehead are relegated mostly to the barest mention, chiefly in bibliographies. Pragmatism and naturalism loom larger than the facts warrant, in the opinion of the reviewer.

The dedication of the volume to John J. Coss is noted with satisfaction. Professor Coss was a modest but competent scholar whose friendly and coöperative spirit endeared him to all who knew him. He was a leader in the work of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy in 1926.

Schneider includes in his preface the modest statement that "a truly comprehensive history of American philosophy remains to be written." That this statement is true and that Schneider's work is not definitive does not detract from the epoch-making character of his contribution. *A History of American Philosophy* will have to be consulted by all future historians and students of American philosophy and religion.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

An Outline of Biblical Theology, by Millar Burrows, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1946, pp. xi, 380, $3.50.

This is a book of prime importance. The old discipline of "biblical theology," which found a system of biblical truth and expounded it doctrine by doctrine, really went out when historical criticism came in. Our Bible is no longer a catalogue of appropriate texts, or an anthology of moralistic tales; though there is real danger that it may remain a library of books awaiting accurate classification by author and date. Instead, it can now be read as a dynamic record of lively spiritual experience and religious reflection.

Unfortunately there is current at the moment a tendency to pay lip service to higher criticism while trying to define once again a so-called "biblical viewpoint" from which all theological problems are to be solved. It is therefore refreshing to find a volume which combines comprehensiveness of scope and accuracy of detail with a clear sense of historical relativity.

Dr. Burrows restricts his footnotes almost exclusively to biblical and rabbinical sources, and thereby gives us an invaluable guide to what different things are said in different parts of the Bible about the same topics. His students, he tells us, declared that the collection of scriptural references is the most valuable thing about the book.

But the author has a larger aim in view: He seeks first to discover what the Bible actually says, then whether the conception under study is tenable, and finally "to what extent and in what sense the Bible remains authoritative for us." This procedure is followed through a wide range of theological topics: authority and revelation, God, Christ, the universe, man and sin, the religious community, salvation, and the Christian life with its moral requirements. The characteristic themes of any text in systematic theology are all here even to such details as the doctrine of adoption, the meaning of "son of man," or the Antichrist. With amazing industry the relevant scriptural passages are assembled, submitted to higher and lower criticism, and interpreted. Any preacher concerned to expound the Bible will find the volume an indispensable reference work.

As one might expect, Professor Burrows as a biblical scholar is stronger in the first step of his method—exegesis—than he is in the critical appraisal of the validity of the ideas he brings to light. Since such critical theological scrutiny as he essays is pursued from a professedly empirical viewpoint, one would expect a painstaking examination of each resultant biblical conception in the light of the widest range of scientific and philosophical knowledge available to him. Unfortunately this sort of criticism is not always forthcoming; and the theological appraisals are at times casual if not superficial. Thus the "distinction of subject-matter . . . between the spheres of religious and secular knowledge, the matters that properly concern religion and those that are of no religious importance" is scarcely as "fruitful" as he claims, since any matter in the right context may take on religious significance. And again, one is surprised to find the old saw repeated that "the question of truth in the Bible is a question of reliable guidance in faith and conduct." How is such guidance separable from one's view of the nature of the physical world?

On the crucial question of New Testament authority he speaks of "the historic origins of Christianity, by comparison with which all later variations and developments must be understood, evaluated, and, if need be, corrected." Does this imply subordination of all later Christian experience to the New Testament pattern? If so, what does he mean by saying that biblical truth "needs constant reformulation in terms of new knowledge"? Is this merely a verbal reformulation or does it affect the substance of faith?

Many students of the Bible will find familiar ideas corrected in this exegetical and historical study. The so-called "trinitarian formula" of Matt. 28:19 f. is not authentic. The confession of faith in Acts 8:37 is an interpolation. The term "savior" does not occur in any of Jesus' sayings. Our idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man "comes from Stoicism rather than the Bible." The Genesis story of the origin of sin "plays no part in any discussion of sin in the rest of the Old Testament"; and the idea of total depravity is unsupported by the Bible.

At a time when so much neoörthodox theology is read into the Bible and made normative as "*the* biblical viewpoint," it is highly important that students of theology should come to know and use Dr. Burrows' book to recover a sound perspective in the exegesis of the scriptures.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

Man as Sinner, by Mary Frances Thelen, New York, King's Crown, 1946, pp. xii, 223, $2.75.

This book gives a detailed and scholarly account of the doctrine of sin in American neoörthodoxy or what is euphemistically called "realistic theology." In Part One the author discusses "the background" of this type of theology, and under this head expounds the relevant teaching of "religious liberalism" as represented by F. R. Tennant, W. E. Hocking, and H. S. Elliott, and "the secular theories of the fall of man" as represented by Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud. In general she charges modern thought with being unduly "optimistic about human nature" and attributes the rise of the "realistic" theology to a reaction against this phase of modernism.

The reaction takes the form of a revival of the doctrine of original sin. And to this revival the second and main part of the book is devoted. The author here begins with the theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, "the leading voice" in American "realism," and traces the development of his theory of original sin from the publication of his *Moral Man and Immoral Society* in 1932 down to his Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* which appeared in 1941 and 1943. With him she associates four more or less kindred spirits. In one chapter she deals with Walter M. Horton and Robert L. Calhoun, and in another with John C. Bennett and H. Richard Niebuhr. The book concludes with a general exposition of the "realistic" doctrine of man as sinner and with two or three criticisms of the doctrine, which, however, are not serious enough to imperil the author's standing as an orthodox "realist."

There is much interesting psychological and sociological material in the book, and if a person wishes to become acquainted with American "religious realism" without extensive reading, he could do no better than invest in this volume. As an historical introduction it is an excellent piece of work. But if he expects to find in it and in the movement which it describes a rational justification of the doctrine of original sin, he will be doomed to disappointment; not, however, because of any fault of exposition on the part of the author or her theological colleagues but because of the inherent irrationality of the doctrine.

Original sin is a subethical and subvolitional conception. It implies, as here expounded, "the inevitability of sin in every act"; and insofar as it does this, it denotes something for which we are not responsible. Such a doctrine logically excludes moral responsibility. Calvinism has from the beginning tried to escape this conclusion. But it has failed and will continue to fail. No amount of verbal legerdemain or "depth psychology" or paradoxical mystification can bridge the chasm between inevitability or necessity on the one hand and moral responsibility on the other. The present volume and the school of thought it represents do nothing to remove this basic and fatal difficulty in the doctrine of original sin.

According to this doctrine "human life on every level of goodness," we are told, is involved in sinful corruption. The noblest as well as the basest deeds of men are under the divine judgment. But such a view is obviously based on a misunderstanding of the true function of the absolute moral ideal. As an unrealizable ideal its function is to serve as a challenge to men not to be content with their present attainments but to be continually seeking something higher and better. It is a source of inspiration,

not a ground of divine condemnation. To take the latter view is to adopt a subethical and sub-Christian conception of deity, and to run counter to the enlightened conscience of mankind. Failure to attain an unrealizable ideal is not sin. To make it such is artificial theorizing, a relic of an imperfectly moralized religiosity, and a fertile source of pious hypocrisy.

Another serious defect in American "religious realism" is the confused and confusing way in which it uses the word *freedom.* Real freedom is the freedom of contrary choice. But the word is often applied to a subvolitional spontaneity and to an extravolitional spontaneity in the right direction, in both of which cases there is no power of contrary choice. Failure to recognize this fact and to distinguish these different uses of the term is one of the besetting sins of the neoörthodox or theological "realists."

With their practical religious aims one may to a large extent sympathize, as the present reviewer does, but their theology tends to *de*-moralize sin and thus to defeat the very purpose they have in view, the deepening of the sin-consciousness. A consistent "freedomism" is the only rational basis for a moralized faith.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON

Toward a United Church: Three Decades of Ecumenical Christianity, by William Adams Brown, New York, Scribner, 1946, pp. xvi, 264, $2.50.

This is the inside story of how the World Council of Churches came into being, written by one of the few American churchmen who participated in the whole process and witnessed most of the crucial episodes. From the year 1914, when he was a delegate to the Constance meeting which formed the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, to the day of his death in December, 1943, Dr. Brown was one of the most active and devoted workers toward the organization of a world federation of churches that would deserve the title, "ecumenical." More than once he has been heard to say, with a glow in his face, that "next to the kingdom of God," he loved and served the cause of Christian unity. It was most fortunate that he had brought this, his last book, nearly to completion at his death, for only he could have written it.

As a general history of the Ecumenical Movement, from its early nineteenth-century antecedents in the Evangelical Alliance and the Student Christian Movement down to its present status, the book[1] is perhaps the most useful brief handbook so far written. But it is particularly valuable for its personal touches. For example, there are personal impressions of the Panama Congress (1916), Stockholm (1925), Lausanne (1927), Jerusalem (1928), Bishopthorpe (1933), Princeton (1935), Westfield, Oxford, Edinburgh (1937), Utrecht (1938), and Amsterdam (1939). Very few persons, outside of the omnipresent John R. Mott, could have written the history of these conferences from memory. What we have here is something better than an objective history; it resembles what an active participant, like Benjamin Franklin, might have written concerning the birth of our country and its constitution. Like Franklin, Brown can report anecdotes of what passed between the principal actors on memorable occasions: What the pope said to the bishop of Fond du Lac, which caused the bishop thrice to shake his fist thereafter (p. 60); what the ecumenical patriarch said about coöperation with Protestants (p. 76); how the German delegates at Stockholm felt about war guilt (pp. 85, 86); what Samuel Zwemer said at

[1] The concluding chapters and appendix are contributed by Dr. Samuel Cavert, of the Federal Council, and Dr. Paul Macy, of the World Council.

Lausanne on finding himself in accord with Professor Deissmann (p. 103); personal factors in the rejection of Brown's resolution on intercommunion and Soderblom's report on church federation, at the same conference (pp. 105-109); Dr. Oldham's words at Westfield, "We have witnessed a miracle" (p. 140); the meaning of the much-discussed "Utrecht formula," and Brown's private opinion of it (p. 146).

In sum it may be said that, with Archbishop Temple and the late Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, of Princeton Theological Seminary, Brown was one of the inner group of determined advocates of Christian unity who brought about the marriage of "Life and Work" with "Faith and Order" in 1937, and so brought the World Council of Churches to birth. (We may add that he and Temple had a private conference about the naming of the child!) And if sinister suspicions are still approved about the motives which inspired the whole movement, it is hard for such suspicions to survive this candid record of what those motives were, and how they were inspired.

Other books will some day give a complete account of these great events, but none will be richer in this kind of inside information.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON

Christian World Mission, edited by William K. Anderson, Nashville, Commission on Ministerial Training of the Methodist Church, ©1946, pp. vii, 275, $2.

Christian World Mission is a remarkable symposium. There are thirty chapters, each complete in itself, on thirty different aspects of the general theme of the book, by thirty eminent authorities representing nine nationalities and eleven different Christian denominations. Naturally there are divergent viewpoints, but there is general agreement that the world mission of the Christian forces is to declare and exemplify the teaching and spirit of Christ as the hope of a distracted world. One shrinks from any attempt to review a book with thirty authors, and one can do little except to call attention to its purpose and some of its characteristics.

Obviously the chief purpose of the book is to give ministers especially a comprehensive understanding of the world mission of the church at this crucial hour in history and to call their attention to currents and conditions that must be taken into consideration. The volume is frankly a missionary apologetic, bold and comprehensive, but it is far more than the advocate of any special branch of the church's work, although its illustrations are chiefly from the Orient, Africa, Latin America, and the South Pacific. It begins by showing that the conception of world mission is rooted far back in the Hebrew tradition, but had a hard struggle to survive through the centuries, although Paul had taken a radical step in teaching that "Christian faith is open to all people on equal terms."

There is a brief statement as to the geographic spread of the early church, but quickly the story turns to the propagation of the gospel in comparatively recent times, first by the Roman Catholics and then by Protestants. Then the reader is treated to an abbreviated "panorama after World War II," which is an attempt to show the effects, good and bad, of the conflict in regions which we commonly regard as the chief mission fields. Very interesting is the chapter on "Japanese Christians in Crisis," which, incidentally, relates the opposition of many Christian leaders to the militarists as war was waged in Manchuria and China and as then threatened against America. And what of the future of the Christian movement in Japan?

"As China Regards Christianity" is treated by an eminent Chinese Christian educator, who reports thoughtful Chinese as asking, "What is your motive in bringing Christianity to us when it seems so impotent in the West?" Similar treatment is given the movements in the Philippine Islands.

Special attention is called to the impression made on American soldiers by what they found among the native Christians on islands in the South Pacific. "Though these converts were cast into a furnace of fire heated seven times hotter than before, they came forth triumphant."

On India the movement toward church union receives special attention, regarding which one of the thirty authors says: "Organization and doctrine would play a relatively minor part. The only qualification for membership would be love and loyalty to Jesus Christ." "In essentials unity; in nonessentials liberty; in all things charity."

The German church struggle is covered by a German, Professor Paul Tillich, who warns that Christians everywhere must always face "the possibility of the relapse of a Christian culture to paganism." Metropolitan Benjamin, of the Russian Orthodox Church, gives a surprisingly favorable report on religious conditions in Russia as he observed them recently.

While many pages are devoted to the "panorama," the heavier portion of the book is directed to "Modern Methods and Objectives." Under that heading the following are some of the topics treated: "Religious Liberty," "Mission Strategy," "The Anthropological Approach," "The Humanitarian Approach," "Rural Life," "Health and Healing," "The United Nations Organization," "Missions and Imperialism." and "The World Mission Tomorrow."

So far a this reviewer knows, *Christian World Mission* is the most comprehensive and stimulating discussion of its kind at present. Practically every chapter deserves careful study in preparation for what appear to be the chief tasks of the Christian forces in the days at hand. The thirty chapters give the cream of the thought of thirty specialists on special subjects. It would mean much for the vision and life of the churches if such a book were widely read. JAMES H. FRANKLIN

The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels, by Alexander Heidel, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1946, pp. ix, 269, $3.50.

Four years ago Dr. Heidel performed a real service to teachers and students of the Bible by publishing a new translation of the Babylonian stories of creation in a volume called *The Babylonian Genesis.* Now the same author has met an even more urgent need by giving a translation of the entire Gilgamesh epic. The eleventh tablet—the one which describes the deluge—of this heroic epic has been available in handbooks, such as those of Rogers and Barton, but the entire poem has been available in English only in the rendering in free rhythms by the poet W. E. Leonard and in the translation of R. Campbell Thompson into ponderous hexameters. The present version is a straightforward—except for several frank passages which have been turned into Latin—translation into English originally made for the Assyrian Dictionary files of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Its value as a translation will undoubtedly be appraised by Dr. Heidel's Assyriological colleagues; pending that verdict by those best qualified to judge the translation itself, one can praise unqualifiedly Dr. Heidel's attempt to fill a real need which has long been felt by students of the Old Testament who are not professional Assyriologists. Not only does the author translate the Gilgamesh epic but he gives a translation of other Babylonian material which is relevant to the central themes of Gilgamesh. The related material includes the following pieces: fragments from Nippur describing the deluge, the Atrahasis epic, Berossus' account of the deluge, Ishtar's descent to the underworld, the myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal, and a tablet from Ashur containing a story of a prince's vision of the underworld. The translations occupy about one half of the book.

Chapter III is a long discussion of "Death and the Afterlife" based on the Babylonian and the biblical material. Unfortunately the biblical material is treated from a somewhat less objective point of view than is the Babylonian. The discussion of Hebrew eschatology is frequently accompanied by purely theological digressions. No attempt is made to arrange the biblical material in its chronological sequence, because Dr. Heidel believes that "there is no conflict between the earlier and the later writings of the Old Testament, *correctly interpreted* [italics mine], in the matter of death and the afterlife." Although the reader may disagree with many of the author's conclusions, he may learn much from the material which is so generously gathered together in this chapter.

The concluding chapter is concerned with the story of the flood. The same sort of criticism applies to this discussion as has been offered for the preceeding chapter. Heidel rejects the documentary hypothesis when applied to the biblical account of the deluge; he attempts to show that there is no discrepancy whatever in the "supposed documents denominated J and P" with regard to the duration of the flood. His argument is not convincing. While he admits that there is a genetic relationship between Genesis and the Babylonian version, there are at the same time the "most far-reaching divergencies" between the two. Needless to say, another might arrive at quite different conclusions with regard to the relationship on the basis of the very same evidence which Dr. Heidel appraises.

Despite the overzealous effort to establish the religious superiority of the Hebrew stories this book is an extremely useful work. A host of students will be grateful for the fresh translation into English of so much Babylonian material on the subject of death and the life after death.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

The History of the Jews of Italy, by Cecil Roth, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1946, pp. xiv, 575, $3.

This is the first complete history of the Jews in Italy, though it has long been a matter of record that their residence in that land began as early as the era of the Maccabees. Not only had they found refuge there, the one country, perhaps, from which they had not been expelled during the Middle Ages, but in addition the strategic position of Italy provided excellent passage by sea and land for trade east and west and into the highlands of northern Europe.

A 553-page book of narrative to be worthy of review should prove itself interesting, comprehensive, and definite. It is. One cannot conceive of anything of significance that has been neglected by the author. Yet the reader has no sense of undue or irrelevant fact finding. The free and simple style belies the extensiveness of his research in the centuries explored.

An Englishman, Cecil Roth was president of the Jewish Historical Society of England from 1936 to 1938. Having made the history of Jews in Italy his special field of research, he was obliged to relinquish his studies when hostilities broke out. At the close of the war, however, he returned to his old familiar grounds and friends and has given, not to his own religious group alone, but to all who care to read, a most informing history of Italian Jewry.

Knowing that space does not permit a review that would do justice to this story with its beginning as early as the days of the Roman republic and closing with the events of yesterday, as the space of time may be calculated, I have chosen three of the most eventful periods of the modern world to illustrate the facts of Jewish life in this land which played so prominent a part in all three.

The first is the Renaissance. The awakening affected the Jews as it did all citizens of this country in which the new age had its birth. Jewish merchant princes and bankers maintained scholars and subsidized literature. Their wealth also provided leisure for their own studies and literary pursuits. At times when Jewish artists were not available to adorn their newly erected synagogues recourse was had to gentiles with curious results on occasion. Some scenes depict Jews performing their religious rites bareheaded, while others introduce representations of the Deity. The traditional love of the Jew for music and dancing and his creative talent in the drama won popular adherence though it met with clerical opposition, and was in no small degree responsible for the survival of these arts. On the other hand, deprived of participation in church art and architecture, the Jews led in many brilliant scientific achievements. Among them were practical engineers, chemists, astronomers, medical scientists, inventors whose services were in demand by reigning dukes and princes as well as by the church.

The revival of the study of the classics, to which the rabbis and Hebrew scholars gave inspiration, led to one event unforeseen and limitless in its effect. Johannes Reuchlin, the German humanist, ambassador in Rome of the Elector Palatinate (1498-1500), stimulated to research in Hebrew and rabbinical writings, returned to his native country to defend the Talmud and Jewish learning which had been condemned by the Dominicans, thus releasing intellectual forces which led shortly to the Lutheran Reformation and a break with the mother church.

The second period, creative of a new world order, was the Napoleonic era. In September 1791, the "rights of man" were extended to the benefit of the Jews in France. When, therefore, in 1796 the French armies invaded Italy, they carried with them these revolutionary ideas more powerful in human emancipation than their military arms. The barriers of the ghettos were broken down and the Jews enjoyed the full freedom of citizens. Everywhere the victories of the Corporal were followed by the manifestoes of liberty for the formerly degraded people. Those privileges, however, imposed upon the Christian communities and states by force of arms, were short-lived. When Napoleon led his troops into Egypt, and when finally he was defeated, the more severe were the atrocities committed upon the Jews of all classes.

The final period is that of the pompous puppet Mussolini. Hoping for the attainment of their just rights, many Jews supported him in founding the Fascist party. Of the fifteen jurists who drew up its constitution, three were Jews. They participated in the concordat with the Vatican in 1929 by which certain measures of protection were assured them, and the privilege of withdrawing their children from Catholic religious instruction and opening their own schools was granted. In 1930 full juridical rights were obtained which included the levying of taxation upon their own people for religious purposes.

Fascism revealed a most benevolent attitude, especially toward Jews in the non-Italian areas around the Mediterranean basin. Efforts were made to bind them to the new Italian imperialism. Encouragement was given to have them come to Italy for higher education, reduced fares for transportation and the virtual cancellation of fees being offered. Rome was to be their nationalistic intellectual capital. The Italian influence which, after the first world war, had spread eastward was capitalized upon by il Duce. The ready response of these long-suppressed people in all lands to this gesture of freedom was expected to bear rich fruit for the plotter of a new empire. Though many did eagerly become his supporters, a large element on the other hand was apprehensive and looked with suspicion upon the movement.

Mussolini was at first sincerely opposed to the anti-Semitism of Nazi Germany and he aided Italian Jews in their efforts to give relief to their oppressed brethren. The change came with his invasion of Abyssinia. The opposition of Britain to this attack threw him into alliance with his former opponents in Germany. There was, moreover, Mussolini's championship of Zionism in Palestine, a shrewd political policy, having its birth in the recognized close relationship which had existed between Italy and the Holy Land for centuries, and having as its purpose the forcing of Britain's mandate over Palestine into Italian hands. This proving impossible, a political turn-about-face was executed in 1936, with support given to the growing hostility of the Arabs. The press began to attack the Jews and to express thorough sympathy with the anti-Semitic propaganda of the Nazi. By the close of 1938 a reversal of policy had been established. Foreign Jews were excluded from the universities, and soon orders were issued for foreigners of Jewish birth to evacuate the country.

As German influence increased, disorders arose and riots with loss of Jewish lives resulted. Within eighteen months, 5,500 Jews, over one-tenth of the entire Italian Jewish population, had left Italy.

Il Duce led his nation into war, June 10, 1940. Nazism ruled throughout the land and the anti-Jewish campaign became intensified. But worse still, as reverses set in with British victories, necessitating invasion by the German armies, the anger and bitterness of defeat vented itself on the helpless Jews. They were forced into the armies, were shut up in the ghettos, deprived of the necessities of life, and deported.

Fascism was rejected July 25, 1943, and to a degree fair treatment of the Jew returned. But Italy was a German armed camp, and in the north especially, where the battle lasted longer, this spelled tragedy and death for the Jew.

Yet the Jew did not rely wholly on the Allies to fight his warfare. In the effort to drive the invading Nazi from the land many victories were aided by the brilliant and brave fighting of the Jew, some of the troops coming from the Holy Land. Rome was delivered June 5, 1944, but of the 12,000 resident Jews of two years previous only 10,000 or less remained. On April 29, 1945, the German armies in Italy surrendered. Of the 42,000 native Jews in the country in 1938, over 6,000 had emigrated, over 5,000 had been deported, and thousands beyond the possibility of counting had died.

So the history of the Jew in Italy is brought down to date. And with brilliant, swift, clear strokes, unobscured to the eye and mind by extraneous touches, Cecil Roth tells his story.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Banner of Jerusalem, by Jacob B. Agus, Bloch, New York, 1946, pp. 243, $3.

The subtitle of this book is "The Life, Times, and Thought of Abraham Isaac Kuk, the late Chief Rabbi of Palestine." It is an exceedingly instructive study of modern Judaism in general, but of Zionism in particular. The subject of the book was born in the small Jewish town of Grieve in the border province of Kurland, northwestern Russia, in 1865, and died in Jerusalem in 1935. He lived and died an orthodox Jew. The portrait which the book carries as a frontispiece shows him with the full beard, the uncut forelocks, and the immense fur cap which is characteristic of Russian orthodox Jews. The life of this eminent rabbi almost spanned the time from the rise of the modern Zionistic movement to the violence of the Jewish radicals of Palestine who are now attempting to get by force from Britain what they have been unable to secure by persuasion.

The account of the recent forerunners of the contemporary Zionists makes an

interesting story, as does also the picture of the pious home life of the scholarly boy who shunned the games and interests of childhood in order to find his happiness studying the Torah. The Russian rabbis guarded their schools against all tendencies toward secular studies. Sciences, literature, philosophy, and even the Russian language were excluded. The curriculum was exclusively rabbinic. One feels the tension between the small Jewish islands of life and the vast Russian sea in which they find themselves enclosed. There is the continuous erosion of the shore as waves beat upon it; there is the threat that in time of storm a tidal wave will engulf it entirely. This means that the Jewish community inevitably surrounds itself with a dike.

Here is the dilemma of assimilation or isolation, which the Jewish communities have faced ever since the fall of the nation in 586 B.C. There have always been some Jews who desired to be absorbed into the cultural and blood stream of the nations in which they lived. That is what happened to other nations of antiquity, with the exception of a few Assyrians and Zoroastrians. But the majority of Jews have made their national survival a tenet of their religious faith. Zionism is therefore the amazing phenomenon of a nationalism which is at least three thousand years old, and for more than two thousand years of that time it has lived on in spite of the fact that it had not one square foot of its own soil on which to lay its head.

Rabbi Kuk was evidently a man of great strength of character and the deepest piety. The several chapters of the book dealing with his mystical experience remind one of the inward spirituality and tenderness of many of the psalms in the Old Testament. They should be of interest to any student of mysticism. The fact that the thought moves in the vocabulary of the cabala does not obscure its essential features. The biographer presents Kuk as the first Jewish literary mystic, which may be relatively true, but I would suggest Philo of Alexandria as a notable predecessor.

But the intensity of the rabbi's devotion to Zionism is the main element in the book. Even as a youth he and a friend had very carefully studied the sacrificial rituals of the Old Testament so that they would be ready to take up their service as priests in the temple as soon as the Messiah restored it. Zionism appears to have been taken that literally. He seems to have believed that all Jews would return to the kind of religion with animal sacrifices which was carried on in the temple of Solomon. Every word of the Torah was literally inspired and no change in it was conceivable.

Zionism for Rabbi Kuk was therefore a purely religious conception. It had nothing to do with such questions as the partition of Palestine between Jews and Arabs, should the Jewish commonwealth be a dominion of the British empire, or, is it to be really an independent Jewish state? Such questions of practical politics appear not to have entered the rabbi's mind. His hope was centred on the coming Messiah, supernatural in character, who would instantly reëstablish the ancient order, purged, of course, of all that is sinful and unclean. He would probably have said that his Zionism was not political at all.

This religious Zionism placed the rabbi in a most interesting position with reference to the great majority of Jews in Palestine, who affirm that Zionism has nothing whatever to do with religion, many of them being outright atheists. Rabbi Kuk was willing to coöperate with any Jew who favored the return to Palestine, whether religious or atheist. God has a place, he held, even for the secular-minded young pioneers of Palestine today, who repudiate every vestige of religious Judaism. Devotion to the sacred soil is a seed which in time will produce all the fruit of a rich spiritual Judaism.

The office of chief rabbi, of course, does not exist in traditional Judaism. The

Jews have no pope or patriarch or the equivalent. But the British government desired to deal with each of its religious groups in Palestine through one spokesman. Hence it created the position of grand mufti for Moslems and chief rabbi for Jews. Yet Jews were unable to unite on a leader. There had to be a chief rabbi for Sephardic or Spanish Jews, and another for Ashkenazic or European Jews. Then the purely religious Zionists refused to have fellowship with the atheistic groups; so they chose their own chief rabbi. There were thus three chief rabbis of Palestine. That Jewish triangle is an aspect of the situation in Palestine today.

S. VERNON MC CASLAND

The Unity of the Church in the New Testament, by Stig Hanson, Uppsala, Almquist & Wiksell, 1946, pp. xi, 197.

Add this book to the mounting list of those concerned with biblical thought. Taking as the basis of his study the idea of unity, the author examines this idea as it is found in the Old Testament and Judaism, the Synoptic gospels and the Pauline epistles excluding Ephesians and Colossians, which he deals with in a separate chapter. In a brief concluding paragraph he considers John and Ignatius. The book is particularly valuable for its very lucid discussion of certain concepts fundamental to both Judaism and Christianity. Among these we might mention the idea of monotheism, of one people and one mission, of the Messiah, and of the eschatological character of unity.

In Judaism, underlying every idea of unity, is the fact of one God. According to Jewish thought there had been an original unity at creation which through disruption had become disunity; the kingdom of God was set over against the kingdom of Satan. Ultimate unity (which in reality means complete surrender to the will of God) is to be realized only in the future with the coming of the Messiah. The only evidence of unity in the present is the "fact" of Israel with its allegiance to "one" God. Hanson indicates that the early Christians made these fundamental ideas the basis of their own thought but only after rejuvenation and transformation. Through a new factor, Jesus the Messiah, God had entered into the disunity to create a new unity. "By doing this He has become the creator and conveyor of a new unity in cosmos and His People, the Church, will be the representative and conveyor of this new unity on earth. Under such circumstances, a new cult, new ethics, and a new theology must arise having their centre in the resurrected Christ" (p. 45).

The idea which is basic to all of the discussions regarding unity is embodied in a phrase coined by the author, "identity of representation," by which he denotes "the relation existing between two parties when one party represents the other and is identical with it in this condition of representation" (p. 19). He contends that to understand the meaning of Jesus as Messiah and the meaning of the unity of the church we must recognize Jesus' corporate personality. God is a unity and thus is one himself; as the representative of God, Jesus the Messiah is in unity with God and so is one; as the representative of the church Jesus incorporates the church and therefore the church is a unity. The principle criticism the reviewer has of Hanson's contention is the confusion created by his use of this coined phrase. The reader is never exactly sure of what he means by "identity of representation." Occasionally he suggests a substantial unity which approaches essential absorption by the Divinity (p. 69), but there is, in general, a confusing inconsistency in usage. As a result of this emphasis on "identity of representation" certain errors emerge. In the first place,

he has both Jesus and Paul concerned over the problem of unity in the abstract. In reference to Paul he writes, "to him the unity of the church is ontologically motivated; it belongs to the very essence of the Church, to its structure." But for Paul the unity of the church was not primarily an abstraction, and for that very reason he found himself driven constantly. Paul conceived of unity in terms of "community"—in a practical rather than a metaphysical sense. Since Hanson conceives of unity in the abstract he neglects what to Jesus and Paul was essential to any idea of unity or community—Christian *agape*. By overemphasizing "corporate" salvation and abstract unity he tends to obscure the identity of the individual as one who stands in relationship to God, Christ, and man. To the reviewer this seems to impair the very essence of the idea of the unity of the church in the New Testament.

Hansons bibliography is valuable; it is extensive and includes the works of many European scholars not generally known in English. A number of names were new to the reviewer. The book, which represents a highly specialized study, indicates the general direction of biblical interpretation among certain European scholars and deserves the consideration of Americans interested in this field.

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG

Problems in Religion and Life, by Anton T. Boisen, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1946, pp. 159, $1.50.

Anton T. Boisen is a familiar name in the field of pastoral counseling. His rich experience of twenty-odd years has been carefully sifted, compiled, and arranged in practical outline to assist the average pastor in grasping a better understanding of the people to whom he ministers by learning to read them as "living documents."

The first division of his book, comprising three chapters, acquaints the reader with methods for obtaining information concerning the total background of a parishioner's life. The procedure is outlined in detailed steps including the community, the home, and the individual's case history. The records required might seem voluminous, but adaptation of the materials to local needs would prove of inestimable help in effective pastoral ministry.

The second division of the book explains the common types of maladjusted people. "Every minister whether he knows it or not is dealing with people who are mentally ill." The traits are so clearly drawn that one, without specialized study, would be able to recognize types and thereby minister to these more adequately. Dr. Boisen divides the types of maladjusted people into five groups—the mentally ill, the delinquent, the sexually maladjusted, the alcoholic, and the physically ill. A procedure is outlined for analyzing and interpreting each case. An excellent list of readings is suggested for those interested in further study. This division comprises a handy manual and assures a place for this book on the pastor's desk rather than in a remote spot on the bookshelf.

The last division of the book deals with general problems a pastor faces in a normal counseling ministry. "The minister," states the author, "is called upon to deal with problems which range from economic distress and physical illness to marital difficulty, bereavement and troubled concience." While admittedly it is not easy to lay down definite rules of procedure, the ones which are suggested are so logical and practical that the art of personal counseling is facilitated for both the young and the more mature pastor. The contributions which the minister can make as a counselor in dealing with troubled people are particularly noteworthy: the far look, the tested insights of conscience, moral standards, religion, sin or guilt, repentance, salvation, and the sovereignity of God.

Leaders of religious education will pause to consider and evaluate the indictment, "The church school seems little more than a pious gesture. Its educational principles are largely unsound. There is overemphasis on formal instruction and in the hands of its poorly equipped teachers even this is poorly done." The "propositions" which Dr. Boisen sets forth in regard to the aim, factors, influence, purpose, and unifying effects of religious education, while not elaborated, might be the considered starting point for rethinking our Protestant church-school educational program.

The treatment of the "conversion problem" by Dr. Boisen will prove interesting to every minister. Neither liberal nor conservative is apt to find comfort in his particular viewpoint. Significantly the author states that most psychiatrists have not given proper attention to the religious aspects of the sick of soul. The need is pointed out to the church for working out "a new type of evangelism which will combine the ringing summons . . . and intensive consideration of the individual problem of those who respond to the summons. This would of course involve a body of skilled members who could deal intelligently and constructively with the individual in whom the better self is struggling to gain posession."

The problems which the minister faces in dealing with the underprivileged, the pressing aspects of moral reconversion in the postwar aftermath, and the impelling need of social action in sharing our religious expression with others are challengingly if not disturbingly presented to one inclined to routine religion here-on-out. The minister prospecting to enrich his field of service, will strike pay dirt if he investigates for himself *Problems in Religion and Life.*

JAMES HOUSTON IVEY

The God We Worship, by Roger Hazelton. New York, Macmillan, 1946, pp. xiii, 160, $2.

This volume, by the professor of the philosophy of religion of Andover Newton Theological School, represents a study in the theology of worship. I say of the theology of worship, because the reiterated contention voiced throughout the entire volume is that the experience of the living God is the centre of worship without which worship never takes place. Typical of the statements which underline this view are these from the first chapter:

> . . . the touchstone of reality in worship is a conviction of the real God, and secondly, that true belief concerning God is essential to the true worship of Him (p. 10);
>
> But if a worshiper has never seen the still windows opened and the radiance of God come streaming through, he has not really worshiped. It is still true that something like this experience is what authentic worship means, for it is the dedicating of life to God, whose presence is affirmed and whose purposes are served from first to last (p. 16).

Our author maintains that the experience of God in worship can never be divorced from the truth of belief. As our belief is, so shall our worship be. If our belief is unworthy, our worship can never rise to the highest levels and may, indeed, prove unworthy of the God of Christian faith. He returns to this thought time and again, particularly taking Calvin to task for his position that God wields his power in an utterly abitrary and despotic way since, having made up his mind from eternity about all things, man now has no chance of free decision. The worship of such a God, it is held, cannot be adoration, but only resignation; not loving reply, but only abject submission. Hazelton indeed questions whether men could do other than fear and hate such a deity. How important it is, accordingly, that the worshiper possess adequate beliefs about God!

Since this is primarily a theology of worship, we can understand why successive chapters deal with the holiness of God and his relation to the good, the power of God, and the love of God. These considerations lead on to the way in which Christ

conditions the worship of the Christian. Since no institution more than the Christian church is the lengthened shadow of its founder, there is an unbroken mystical continuity between Christ and his followers down across the centuries. Hence Christian worship is continuously refreshed by "the main current of the indwelling presence of Christ." With the eyes of faith the Christian of the twentieth century sees the Christ of Christian experience, finding in him "the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Since that is so, Christian worship is essentially an experience of God in Christ, which means "that Christ is himself divine, truly resembling the Father, to the fullest possible degree that man can be like God. On this basis, Christ becomes the medium of our common worship, the channel through which it is offered and its benefits conferred" (p. 135). The fulfillment of Christian worship, therefore, has as its theological background the conviction that God was in Christ.

One finds in this interesting volume a fascinating blending of philosophical and mystical strands to give credence and appeal to the Christian experience of worship. When one worships, one is not engaging in an irrational practice. There is, for example, an organic connection between values and nature. Values are not something which we wrest from a hostile environment, but are deep-rooted in "the soil of fact." Hence there is an interdependence between fact and value, nature and life, things and ideals. But when we find this to be so, must we not go further and assume "a structure and a process operating beyond human intention and effort, yet also through them, to create and re-create the "good" (p. 59)? Hazelton stresses that such has ever been the position of the Christian faith. The Christian's belief in the goodness of God grows out of the objective character of value. Hence in worship one is not cutting across reasoned thought, but is simply fulfilling its findings through adoration and communion.

The mystical must be added to the philosophical if Christian worship is to be complete. Continuity must be established between the Christ of historical faith and our Christian living today. When such mystical attachment to Christ is effected, we find him to be a living spiritual influence even in our day who brings us into God's very presence.

The present volume will prove of value to all who seek truly to worship and who desire a theology by which to guide the worship experience. GEORGE W. DAVIS

Albert Schweitzer: Christian Revolutionary, by George Seaver, New York, Harper, ©1944, pp. 130, $2.

One of the great men of our time is Albert Schweitzer, doctor of philosophy for a thesis on the religious philosophy of Kant, doctor of theology for a treatise on the Synoptic gospels, doctor of music for a monumental work on Bach, and finally doctor of medicine. He is known outside the theological world as an authoritative exponent of Bach's organ music and as a missionary doctor in Africa.

The present book—it was published in 1944 in England and has just been issued in the United States—seeks to explain to his lay admirers Schweitzer the scholar. This it does with special reference to his philosophical ethics.

In 1906 Dr. Schweitzer startled the theological world with his book *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (translated in 1910 as *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*), in which he attacked attempts to modernize Jesus, repudiated traditional Christologies, and resolutely placed Jesus back in his own age, a Jew who accepted the eschatological expectations of that day. This eschatological emphasis was, in the judgment of many

New Testament scholars, overdone; but it is the clue to Schweitzer's own ethical theories.

For Schweitzer separates ethics from metaphysics, very much in the Kantian fashion. No examination of the realm of being can yield ethical criteria, he contends. Rather, we must affirm an ethical principle and proceed from that to our world view. The ethical principle is the "absolute ethic of love," embodied in Jesus, and having the final claim upon us. In this sense he extracts from the historical Jesus an "essence," universal and eternal. To the obedient Christian Christ reveals himself. This is Schweitzer's "practical mysticism." It is grounded in a pessimistic view of the natural world, but finds grounds for optimism in the triumph of the spirit over nature.

In his unfinished work on *The Philosophy of Civilization* he reviews the history of Western ethical theories, rejecting alike the optimism of the Greeks, the eighteenth-century rationalists and Nietzsche, and the pessimism of Schopenhauer and Hartmann; and states his own principle of "reverence for life."

According to this principle, each person is "a life that wills-to-live in the midst of other life that wills-to-live"; and, realizing this, seeks both to perfect himself and to enhance the life of others. It is an ethic that combines self-perfection with self-devotion; and it seeks to overcome the strife between competing wills-to-live. The demands of this ethic are inexorable and Schweitzer himself gave up a highly successful academic career to discharge the debt of civilized Western man to the "backward" races whom we had exploited.

Such an ethic is at root a principle of self-consistency, of veracity. At its height it is "the ethic of Jesus brought to philosophical expression, extended into cosmical form, and conceived of as intellectually necessary." If it had to be classified as collectivistic or individualistic, it would definitely be individualistic. Indeed, "it is only in individuals that the ethical can ever come into existence."

Kant continues to haunt theology and ethics, and his influence is seen in the separation of ethics from nature philosophy in Schweitzer's thought. The transcendental ethic that emerges has its affinities with eschatological thought: salvation is found in freedom from nature. But the attempt to draw a sharp distinction between human action and natural events, while it may preserve ethical freedom speculatively, destroys it psychologically; for human behavior is a series of natural events, and nature is both the milieu and the medium of decisive ethical action. Schweitzer is consequently caught in the dilemma of his avowed pantheism; if it be pessimistic, the nerve of ethics is cut since no good is possible; if it be optimistic, it falls under his own strictures concerning "the optimistic world-affirmation" which he has rejected.

Mr. Seaver has sifted and organized the material from the great Alsation so as to give a very clear and judicious account of Schweitzer's ethical theory.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

Ancient Records and the Bible, by J. McKee Adams, Nashville, Broadman, ©1946, pp. xi, 397, $3.75.

Dr. Adams, who died September 17, 1945, less than half a year after the date of the preface, was one of the leading scholars of the Southern Baptists, though President Fuller has exaggerated in saying that he "was recognized throughout the Christian world as one of the greatest scholars in the field of Biblical Archæology" (p. xii). He spent two years at Crozer Theological Seminary and the University of Pennsylvania, and was for many years professor of biblical archæology at the Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville. From 1928 on he made numerous trips abroad, par-

ticularly to the Near East. He was in no sense an original scholar, and there are numerous indications in the volume before us that his reading knowledge was limited to English. His work was, accordingly, of exclusively apologetic character, and was designed solely for popular appeal.

As might be expected from the foregoing sketch, the book is a compilation from popular or semipopular English works, with no reference to French or German publications in the field, or even to articles in learned journals (unless *Asia* and the *National Geographic* are of this category). The author's geography and topography are good; but his archæology and chronology are confused, and his philology is a minus quantity. He has assembled his material with some care, and many of the typographical errors may safely be blamed on posthumous proofreading. The following three extreme examples of his weaknesses may serve as a warning; they are in some respects typical of the work as a whole. On p. 109 there is a 25-line account of the Lachish Ewer, which hopelessly confuses two entirely distinct objects, a tall water jar bearing an inscription in archaic Canaanite alphabetic characters on its shoulder, and a shallow bowl, on which is written a memorandum in Egyptian hieratic characters! One whould have thought that the direct contradictions with which this section abounds would have warned the author that something was amiss. On p. 141 there is a nine-line quotation from a book by Wellhausen (which happens to be the only reference to any European book in the whole volume), taken without the slightest change in wording from the reviewer's book, *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible,* p. 129. Though the reviewer had translated the passage from German, only the reviewer's citation of the original volume is cited (but without any mention of the reviewer). In the bibliography (pp. 357-361) the reviewer is credited with the following book, "*Excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim,* Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1935." There is no such book; the nearest thing to it is *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim,* New Haven, 1932-33-37-43 *(Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* XII, XIII, XVII, XXI/XXII).

The book is printed on good paper with wide margins; it is provided with scores of illustrations and maps, grouped in unnumbered plates outside the text. The cuts are well selected and they include many original photographs taken by the author, but some of the originals were poor and the reproduction is cheap. On the other hand, the maps are new and superior. The volume will undoubtedly fill a very real need in the circles for which it is intended; other readers may use it as a general guide but must be warned not to accept any statement of the author without a careful check.

W. F. ALBRIGHT

Last Reprieve? by Edwin McNeill Poteat, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. v, 105, $1.

In this book Dr. Poteat asks us to assemble a committee, conference, or some other deliberative body and have it try to find a common basis for an international moral law that will serve for our time, that is, for the "Atomic Age." He proposes that this body use only scientific methods and nominates for membership the historian, anthropologist, sociologist, endocrinologist, psychiatrist, psychologist, and physicist. They are to be promised protection from philosopher and theologian and are to find how we add to our new powers without adding to our fears. They are to be instructed that our escape lies not in stifling research or soothing fear, but in discovering the laws of human behavior that are as inviolable as the laws of physics and history and mind, and that once this universal moral law is found, men must yield themselves utterly to it. He argues that once this universal moral law is found it will point the way to international peace and understanding, that all the problems of

the United Nations will be solved, and that we shall have "World Government Now."

His proposal is akin to that advanced for "World Government Now." We do not make a government by drawing up a set of rules first; this is always the end process, never the beginning. Men must live together, form common habits, and cooperate on the functional level before government can be instituted among them. Although Paris is only a half day's travel from New York and we are all in the same boat, this does not prove the existence of a world community or that the world would accept the conclusions of such a congress. From what I read of the efforts of the men who have made atomic energy possible, their great difficulty is not in getting a hearing, but in getting across what they have to say about the moral issues involved in the control and use of this power. That is, they are not politicians or preachers, and although men accept without much question or proof the results of scientific discovery and research, they appear to want to cuss and discuss their own actions and beliefs and revise them only in the light of their own experiences.

The opening paragraph of the introduction to this book is a good summary of it:

> This is one more in the spate of books, monographs, essays and miscellaneous reflections that the atom bomb has inspired—or if inspired be too ingratiating a word, exploded. It is certain not to be the last. Unless the direst predictions of the fearful are realized at once, there will be time for more of the same. The likelihood is that the last word will never be said or written.

JOHN L. CLAYTON, JR.

Whereon to Stand, by John Gilland Brunini, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. xvii, 302, $3.

Protestants and Roman Catholics are miles apart in basic philosophy, dogmatic doctrine, and ecclesiastical government. "The medieval Roman Catholic aristocratic conception of moral and social values," says Yale's Professor F. S. C. Northrop in *The Meeting of East and West,* "grounded in naturalistic Aristotelian divine law, opposes the modern Protestant democratic and pragmatic concept of an ecclesiastical and civil law which derives its authority solely from the humanistic convictions of a majority of men."

At the same time, Protestants and Catholics agree on recognition of God; a moral law, the full, inescapable implications of which man is gradually discovering; the spiritual interpretation of life; the brotherhood of man; and the goal of the struggle for the kingdom of God on earth. Protestants have blueprints for the city of God which differ in some repects from St. Augustine's, but still the two groups agree on the fact of evil, the necessity of redemption, the value of religious education, and the necessity of implementing religious teachings with social action for that which is righteous, good, true, and beautiful. On some of this action Protestants and Roman Catholics can join forces.

Mr. Brunini's book is what baseball players would call an "assist" in this team play. He admirably presents Roman Catholic beliefs and practices, as an informed and convinced Catholic layman, in language that a popular public can understand. The author tells the story of the history, teachings, and claims of the Roman Catholic Church. Protestants should know what their Roman Catholic neighbors believe and the reasons on which it rests, and this book will tell them. The major source of prejudice is ignorance, and the best cure for it is understanding. If we rightly comprehend what others believe, we may still disagree with them profoundly but we are not as likely to dislike, distrust, or malign them. Catholicism should be interpreted by informed Catholics, not by Protestants. That the reverse is true, that Protestantism should be interpreted by informed Protestants and that Catholics are unlikely to do so adequately or accurately, is illustrated at more than one point in Mr. Brunini's book. Francis Cardinal Spellman, in an introduction, endorses Mr. Brunini's book as a valid statement of Catholic doctrine. EVERETT R. CLINCHY

BOOK NOTICES

Christian Ethics and Social Policy, by John C. Bennett, New York, Scribner, 1946, pp. 132, $2.

This is a straightforward and practical if unpretentious little book and it will do its part in helping to throw light on the ethical choices the Christian confronts today. It begins by showing how cluttered up our decisions are by the distortions caused by our unconscious self-love and the ambiguities of accumulated political hatreds. Then it goes on to speak of what Dr. J. H. Oldham has called "middle axioms," or suggestions for action that are more concrete than universal maxims yet less specific than actual legislative programs. As an example it is shown how the Commision on a Just and Durable Peace moved from general guiding principles to a middle axiom calling for a political program that would make continuing collaboration of the United Nations possible, and then went on to a more definite recommendation of the San Francisco Charter. Professor Bennett makes a strong case for the need of the church as a base for operations in a world that is still alien to the Christian point of view. He points out that it is the only school in which we are trained for dual citizenship (in the city of God and the city of man) and that we need it as a bond of union between peoples now sorely divided. The church brings men together, it acts for freedom, it criticizes existing practices, it reveals to its members their own misunderstood motives and renews their sense of responsibility for their own acts. To me the book was especially effective in its analysis of the factors which blur our understanding of what is good and interfere with our single-minded pursuit of it. I am not sure that the argument was strengthened by giving these practical difficulties the theological name of "original sin."

J. S. BIXLER

The Lives of the Prophets, by Charles Cutler Torrey, Philadelphia, Society of Biblical Literature (Monograph Series, Vol. I), 1946, pp. 53, $1.

The Society of Biblical Literature is to be congratulated on this first number of a proposed series of monographs. Acknowledgment is made by Dr. Pfeiffer of the generous gift by the L. N. Littauer Foundation of New York of the funds needed for the publication of the book. The editor of this first monograph has most wisely chosen, as appears in the study of it. The ancient material here presented may be novel to many students, as it is indeed to the present reviewer. The Greek title of the book is "The names of the Prophets and whence they were, where they died, and where and how they were buried." The book is found in the Greek Old Testament manuscript, Codex Marchalianus, in a work of Epiphanius, in another ascribed to Dorotheos, and in Syriac manuscripts. The author of the monograph gives a careful and critical account of these sources and of their earlier publication. There has naturally been question as to the date and the original language of this ancient document. He comes to the positive conclusion that the original was Hebrew and of the first Christian century. Difficulties in the Greek and Syriac can be explained as faulty translations of Hebrew. As the editor remarks, we have here an interesting addition to Jewish Apocrypha. After the Introduction the Greek is presented with critical notes and corrections (pp. 20-32). There follows the translation with further notes and useful cross references to the Bible. The prophets included are the four major and twelve minor prophets, and then Nathan, Ahijah, Joed (*cf.* II Chron. 9:29), Azariah, Zechariah son of Jehoiada, Elijah, Elisha. In several cases the lives have

a long extension of legendary material *e.g.*, those of the major prophets, also Jonah and Habakkuk. Of interest is the exact placement of the tombs of the prophets, for which may be compared in ancient story I Kings 13:29 ff.; II Kings 23:16 ff. We have here early precursors of the Arabic *Welis* and of tombs dedicated by tradition to saints of the Christian church.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

The Preaching Ministry Today, by Rolland W. Schloerb, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. viii, 113, $1.25.

What can one say about preaching that has not already been said by Beecher and Brooks, Broadus and Brown? If Dr. Schloerb does not say anything essentially new, he selects with discernment some timeless principles which need reiteration, and restates them with a freshness and a relevance that make them sound new. It may seem trite to say that preaching should have an object as well as a subject, but anyone who has tried to teach homiletics will appreciate that it is a truism that needs to be repeated again, and again, and again. Equally helpful and discerning is Dr. Schloerb's counsel concerning the ultimate goals and immediate hazards of preaching; preaching as the proclamation of news; preaching as the communication of insight; preaching as the summons to action; and preaching as a pastoral function. While the basic ideas are those fundamentals of homiletics tested through centuries of preaching, the approach is by a not-too-familiar trail, and as we travel it the author, who is the gifted pastor of the Hyde Park Baptist Church in Chicago, brings to our attention things we had not seen or, if seen, had not fully appreciated before. The treatment is timely and refreshing, and there are sentences whose full significance, if taken to heart, might put new life into our ministry. For instance: Concerning preaching as the communication of insight, he writes:

> The average American churchman who hears sermons would no doubt cast an affirmative vote if he were asked if he believed in the cardinal Christian doctrines. . . . About most of these matters he does not need to be argued with and convinced. What he needs most is to see the import and the importance of such beliefs. He needs to be inspired by them, and drawn to them, and enlarged in his understanding of what they mean now.

Concerning preaching as a pastoral function, he says:

> Preaching tends to become too abstract, too academic, too unrelated to human needs unless a minister mingles with his people and finds out what their particular problems are. . . . So some preachers may do pastoral work in order that they might become effective in the pulpit. . . . I believe that the reverse is nearer the truth: preaching is a pastoral function. The minister does not do pastoral work in order that he may preach good sermons—he tries to preach good sermons in order that he may be a good pastor. His first concern is people. The first aim of preaching is not to preach good sermons, but to produce better people.

Seldom has so much sound homiletical common sense been packed into so small a space. The volume will prove of value, not only to students but also to experienced preachers.

JAMES D. MORRISON

On Being Fit to Live With, by Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. ix, 219, $2.

At least three things help to make this about the choicest collection of Fosdick sermons we have. Maturity, opportunity, and the times in which we are living—all three are constantly in evidence. Naming a book of sermons from the title of one, often the first, is, I suppose, a publishing beguilement. In this case the reader might expect a book more or less like the one *On Being a Real Person*—in other words, a real book on a real subject. It should be said, however, that every sermon contributes to the thesis, though naturally in different degrees. Dr. Fosdick has been

preaching many years. His sermons have always been models of industry and insight. Here one finds the ripened product. Hardly any preacher, since Spurgeon, has had such variety and intensity of opportunity. These sermons are freighted with this unique experience. As to the "times," few have realized better what they demand of the preacher and of us. Read for this "On Standing by the Best in an Evil Time." Consider his talent on mastering "The Use of Psychology" without being mastered by it. And read "The Constructive Use of Fear." Count up the references to Russia, enough and not too many, and of the proper sort. It would be hard to name a book of contemporary sermons more suggestive to the preacher seeking the word to be spoken in this pregnant and tremendous *now.* E. C. HERRICK

James Harvey Robinson, Teacher of History, by Luther V. Hendricks, New York, King's Crown, 1946, pp. xii, 120, $2.

This modest work is concerned with James Harvey Robinson as an educator. It essays to describe and to evaluate this historian's place in the movement which changed the emphasis for the teaching of history from attention to dates and dynasties to concern for the many aspects of man's life in the world. In this movement, which began at the turn of this century, Robinson was a leader. The author of this study summarizes Robinson's views with regard to the teaching of history thus:

> (1) History in explaining how things came about was to embrace the law of historical continuity; (2) it was to be comprehensive in content, concerning itself with everything that man had ever done or thought since he first appeared on earth; (3) it was to welcome the aid of other social sciences such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology; (4) its primary interest was to be in interpreting historical data with special emphasis on the more recent period of history; (5) historical knowledge should be selected, organized. and applied in the interest of social betterment.

Robinson was avowedly interested in exploiting the past in the interests of the present and the future. His influence was felt in the establishment of the New School for Social Research, in numerous textbooks on history for schools and colleges, and in the work of teachers who were prepared for their profession under his direction at Columbia. This work is a careful study which is likely to be of considerable use to educators in the field of history. JAMES B. PRITCHARD

Beyond This Darkness, by Roger L. Shinn, New York, Association Press, 1946, pp. viii, 86, $1.

This book of eighty-six pages is significant, if for no other reason, because it is the first in a series of books to be published dealing with moral and religious questions of young men and women. It is called a *Haddam House Book,* Haddam House being a publishing project in the field of religious literature for youth. It is supported by the Hazen Foundation which gave us in the recent years the thirteen Hazen Books, written by well-known scholars in the field of religion, which sold so widely among college and university students. The new series, the *Haddam House Books,* will appear from time to time under the direction of President Paul Limbert, of Springfield College, who is chairman of a strong editorial board. The author of *Beyond This Darkness* was a graduate of Union Theological Seminary in 1941. He had been awarded a traveling fellowship but chose to enter the Army ás a private, rising to the rank of captain before going overseas. He was in the thick of the fighting, and was taken prisoner by the Germans. He had a wide and intimate acquaintance with the fighting men of the services, and out of the deep searching of his own soul he writes with the hope that he may convey a bit of what

the faith of Christianity says to our common life amid its ideologies, tensions, confusions, and contradictions. The chapter headings of this compact book are "Lest We Forget," "The Clash of War and Christian Faith," "Meeting Death and Suffering," "Inflicting Death and Suffering," "The New Fear," "That These Dead Shall Not Have Died in Vain," and "For Us the Living." One feels the need of expansion and amplification at some points, but that is a minor matter. It is a soul-searching presentation. The author dedicates this book "to all those people of every country, civilians or fighters, who suffered in the Second World War with a hope of serving God and helping men!" It is directed to young men and women who are looking forward, who will live their lives in the world that they must help make. It could be placed with great profit in the hands of veterans who are looking for light and direction. This book might also be used as the basis of a series of discussions in which nonveteran adults and young people could join with great profit. *Beyond This Darkness* is not just another war story.

FREDERICK B. IGLER

Heralds of God, by James S. Stewart, New York, Scribner, 1946, pp. 222, $2.50.

These Warrack Lectures were published with the author's hope that they would reach beyond the circle of students and ministers and "have something to say to the wider circle of those who Sunday by Sunday are hearers of the Word of God . . . and perhaps even to the critic in the back pew" (p. 5). They certainly should. Here is preaching presented as an art, as a joy and a satisfaction, and as a challenge. Ministers who read will untimately take time to reconsider their message and examine their method and although they may be humbled they will also be encouraged. "Sunday hearers" will discover an engaging personality, a wealth of literary background and, within themselves, an emerging respect for the preacher. The critic may feel a disagreement with the somewhat uncritical devotion of the author, but it will probably be accompanied by a trace of wistfulness. The Preacher's World, Theme, Study, Technique, and Inner Life are the subjects of the lectures. Few will be done with the volume after reading it; they will frequently return to the check-marks they have made in the margins.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

The Layman Looks at the Minister, by Murray H. Leiffer, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1947, pp. 160, $1.50.

A thousand Methodist laymen, including some women and youth, have responded to a questionnaire concerning seventy qualities which they might like or dislike in a minister. They deal with the minister as a man, a preacher, a pastor, an administrator, in social service, and so on. The questions are well formed, and the answers carefully classified give a sympathetic and thoughtful estimate of a minister's life and work, one that would be particularly stimulating to young preachers. Such a treatment, where the editor is only a collector even though the answers are classified, is as choppy as the book of Proverbs. One misses the contribution of an interpreting mind such as one finds in the Yale Lectures on Preaching and the books of Henry Sloan Coffin. The result is a collection of ingredients, but they have not been fused in one mind so that one may see the ideal preacher in action and life.

ARTHUR C. BALDWIN

Dachau Sermons, by Martin Niemöller, translated by Robert H. Pfeiffer, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. vii, 97, $1.50.

So much has been written and argued abour Martin Niemöller that it is virtually impossible to consider these sermons apart from the man and the occasion. On one point, however, we may happily be silent: the matter of his relation to the Nazi government. There is in no word or slightest suggestion in the sermons as to this ticklish question. To read them in the light of an imagination that sees seven men (later eight men and a woman) worshiping in a concentration camp cell, once a month, is to feel something of the invisible presence they proclaim. Here is an occasion for preaching a simple, unfaltering faith in the mysteries of a revealed religion. Courage and hope are the basic needs of these Dachau prisoners. This is precisely what Niemöller preached, and preached it effectively and persuasively. This is, indeed, another volume of Christian "prison literature." If it were anything less, we should suspect the preacher. If it were anything more, we should suspect an editor.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

On Final Ground, by Harold A. Bosley, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. xi, 260, $2.

This first volume of sermons by an author whose previous books have been a presentation of the philosophy of the Christian religion are examples of straightforward preaching to the world needs and problems of our day. They are set against the background of a confusion about belief and a bewilderment concerning the possibility of a rational faith. To this the first ten sermons are addressed. The method is the making of devotion reasonable. The remaining sermons are in a different framework and, while sacrificing nothing of contemporaneity or intelligent alertness, are more specifically congregational addresses. The sermons well illustrate why the author is a popular university preacher.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Successful Letters for Churches, by Stewart Harral, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1946, pp. 247, $2.

Here is a volume that lives up to its promises. A man of experience in the field of public relations brings all his fine ability to the practical problem of persuading people by mail. The reader is convinced on two scores concerning the value of having such a book of reference: first, that in the opening chapters the author does a magnificent piece of evaluation of purpose and procedure in church letter writing, and secondly, that his wealth of excellently selected illustrative material really demonstrates the validity of his confidence in persuasive mail. The entire treatment is realistic and profitable for adaptation in the many and various types of letters suggested. The reviewer has long been convinced that the cynicism attaching to letter writing in church promotion throve chiefly on the casual and ineffective use of this medium of information and invitation. Harral shows beyond a doubt that imagination, industry, and a degree of continuance on a high level assure real achievement. Younger men especially who are launching out upon this valuable field of influencing opinion will mistake in not having this book of practical wisdom at hand. Whether it be a campaign letter as part of a general campaign, a letter of general information as to programs about to be initiated, or the more intimate personal expressions of courtesy and concern in one's own hand—in all, we find here real and convincing direction. This is the sort of book which gives administration and organization added meaning, and working with the stuff of them satisfying pleasure.

IVAN MURRAY ROSE

BOOKS RECEIVED

**Outlines of Judaism,* by Samuel Price, New York, Bloch, 1946, pp. xiii, 222, $2.75.

**Christian Faith and My Job,* by Alexander Miller, New York, Association Press, 1946, pp. xiii, 60, $1.

**The Gospel, the Church, and the World,* edited by Kenneth Scott Latourette, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. xvi, 229, $1.50.

**Toward World-Wide Christianity,* edited by O. Frederick Nolde, New York, Harper, ©1946, pp. xvi, 263, $1.50.

**The Modern Parent and the Teaching Church,* by Wesner Fallaw, New York, Macmillan, 1946, pp. xiv, 228, $2.50.

**Religion on the American Frontier: Vol. IV, The Methodists,* by William Warren Sweet, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1946, pp. ix, 800, $10.

**Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek,* by Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton, privately printed, 1946, pp. ix, 110, $1.

**Human Destiny,* by Lecomte du Noüy, New York, Longmans Green, 1947, pp. xix, 289, $3.50.

Jewish Feasts and Fasts, by Julius H. Greenstone, New York, Bloch, 1946, pp. x, 317, $3.

This volume is a collection of essays which appeared originally in the *Jewish Exponent* of Philadelphia. Dealing as they do with the major celebrations of the Jewish year, they should be of interest to any who wish brief, nontechnical discussions of many of the religious customs of Judaism.

**Living Memorials,* by J. Randolph Sasnett, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1947, pp. 192, $2.50.

**Christian Perfection (Fénelon),* edited by Charles F. Whiston and translated by Mildred W. Stillman, New York, Harper, ©1947, pp. xiii, 208, $1.75.

Points for Emphasis, 1947, by Hight C. Moore, Nashville, Broadman, ©1946, pp. 192, 50 cents.

Sunday-school helps for 1947.

**Creation Continues,* by Fritz Kunkel, New York, Scribner, 1947, pp. xiv, 317, $3.

**Science and Freedom,* by Lyman Bryson, New York, Columbia University Press, 1947, pp. xi, 191, $2.75.

**Comfort Ye My People,* by Russell Dicks, New York, Macmillan, 1947, pp. ix, 136, $1.50.

**A Plain Man's Life of Christ,* by A. D. Martin, New York, Macmillan, 1947, pp. xii, 217, $2.

The Power of the Cross, by Herman Hoeksema, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1947, pp. 135, $1.50.

Eight sermons.

**Ancient Christian Writers: St. Augustine's the First Catechetical Instruction,* translated by Joseph P. Christopher, Westminster (Md.), Newman Bookshop, 1946, pp. 171, $2.50.

**A Functional Approach to Religious Education,* by Ernest J. Chave, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, © 1947, pp. ix, 168, $2.50.

**The Old Testament in the New Testament,* by R. V. G. Tasker, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1947, pp. 176, $2.

**The Doctrine of the Imitation of God in Plato,* by Culbert Gerow Rutenber, New York, King's Crown, 1946, pp. 115, $1.50 (paper).

**The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man,* by H. and H. A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson, Thorkild Jacobsen, and William A. Irwin, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1946, pp. vii, 401, $4.

**Prophetic Religion,* by J. Philip Hyatt, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1947, pp. 188, $1.75.

**Modern Trends in Islam,* by H. A. R. Gibb, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1947, pp. xiii, 141, $2.50.

Lot's Wife and the Science of Physics, by Harry Rimmer, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1947, pp. 160, $2.50.

The tone and taste of this volume by a Wheaton (Illinois) Sc. D. may be inferred by his treatment of the biblical incident from which the title is chosen: "First she turned to *rubber* and then she turned to salt."

**Fletcher, Beaumont & Company,* by Lawrence B. Wallis, New York, King's Crown, 1947, pp. xiii, 315, $3.75.

**A Scientist's Approach to Religion,* by Carl Wallace Miller, New York, Macmillan, 1947, pp. vii, 127, $2.

**450 Stories from Life,* edited by Leonard Rush Jenkins, Philadelphia, Judson, 1947, pp. 336, $2.50.

* To be reviewed.